arXiv:1402.3931v1 [math.PR] 17 Feb 2014

CHOICES AND INTERVALS

PASCAL MAILLARD AND ELLIOT PAQUETTE

Abstract. We consider a random interval splitting process, in which the splitting rule depends on the empirical distribution of interval lengths. We show that this empirical distribution converges to a limit almost surely as the number of intervals goes to infinity. We give a characterization of this limit as a solution of an ODE and use this to derive precise tail estimates. The convergence is established by showing that the size-biased empirical distribution evolves in the limit according to a certain deterministic evolution equation. Although this equation involves a non-local, non-linear operator, it can be studied thanks to a carefully chosen norm with respect to which this operator is contractive.

In finite-dimensional settings, convergence results like this usually go under the name of *stochastic approximation* and can be approached by a general method of Kushner and Clark. An important technical contribution of this article is the extension of this method to an infinite-dimensional setting.

1. Introduction

Consider the following stochastic process on the unit circle. At its initiation, finitely many distinct points are placed on the circle in any arbitrary configuration. This configuration of points subdivides the circle into a finite number of intervals. At each time step, two points are sampled uniformly from the circle. Each of these points lands within some pair of intervals formed by the previous configuration. Add the point that falls in the larger interval to the existing configuration of points, and discard the other. If there is a tie, break it by flipping a fair coin, and continue adding points to the circle ad infinitum. We call this process the *max*-2 *process*. If instead of keeping the points that fall in the larger intervals, we keep the points that fall in the smaller intervals, we call this process the *min*-2 *process*. If we simply choose between the two points uniformly at random, then we recover standard i.i.d. sampling of points from the circle, which we call the *uniform process*.

Heuristically, the effect of having the two choices in the max-2 process should be to more evenly distribute the points around the circle than the uniform process. In effect, the points repulse each other, as short intervals will be subdivided less frequently and large intervals will be subdivided more frequently. In the min-2 process, on the other hand, points should have some tendency to clump together, so as to cause abnormally dense regions on the circle. Nevertheless, we conjecture that in all cases, the limiting distribution of points is uniform on the circle (see paragraph "Open problems" below).

Date: February 18, 2014.

PM is supported by a grant from the Israel Science Foundation. EP is supported by NSF Postdoctoral Fellowship DMS-1304057.

Main result. In this article, we focus on the evolution of the law of a typical interval length. We first formalize the dynamics of the process. Let $I_1^{(n)}, I_2^{(n)}, \dots, I_{n+n_0}^{(n)}$ denote the lengths of the intervals after n steps of the process (started with n_0 intervals). Define the size-biased empirical distribution function by

$$\widetilde{D}_n(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n+n_0} I_i^{(n)} \mathbf{1}\left\{ I_i^{(n)} \leq x \right\}.$$

This function is now defined to evolve according to Markovian dynamics as follows. Given $\widetilde{D}_n$, at the $(n+1)$-st step we choose an interval at random, with length $\ell_n = \widetilde{D}_n^{-1}(u)$, where u is sampled from a law on $(0,1]$ whose cumulative distribution function we denote by Ψ. This randomly chosen interval is now subdivided into two pieces at a point chosen uniformly inside the interval. This produces a new sequence of interval lengths $I_1^{(n+1)}, I_2^{(n+1)}, \dots, I_{n+n_0+1}^{(n+1)}$ and the process is repeated. We call the resulting process the Ψ-process. Note that the max-2, uniform and min-2 processes are Ψ-processes with $\Psi(u) = u^2$, u and $1-(1-u)^2$, respectively.

For $n \geq 0$, denote by μ_n the empirical distribution of the rescaled interval lengths $(n+n_0)I_1^{(n)}, \dots, (n+n_0)I_{n+n_0}^{(n)}$, i.e.

$$\mu_n = \frac{1}{n+n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n+n_0} \delta_{(n+n_0)I_i^{(n)}}.$$

Set $D_n(x) = \widetilde{D}_n(x/(n+n_0))$ for $n \geq 0$, $x \geq 0$, so that $D_n(x) = \int_0^{x+} y\, \mu_n(dy)$. Our main theorem is the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that Ψ is continuous and satisfies $1-\Psi(u) \geq c(1-u)^{\kappa_\Psi}$ for some $c > 0$ and $\kappa_\Psi \in [1, \infty)$, for all $u \in (0,1)$. Then there is an absolutely continuous probability measure μ^Ψ on $(0,\infty)$ with mean 1, independent of the initial configuration, such that D_n converges pointwise to the function $F^\Psi(x) = \int_0^x y\, \mu^\Psi(dy)$, almost surely as $n \to \infty$. In particular, μ_n (weakly) converges to μ^Ψ, almost surely as $n \to \infty$. The function F^Ψ is the same as in Lemma 3.5.*

A remark on the assumptions in Theorem 1.1: we believe that continuity of Ψ is not necessary for the theorem to hold. It is probably possible to extend our proof to cover the cases of discontinuous Ψ, at the expense of more involved *a priori* bounds. However, we have not worked out the details. As for the second assumption, we first remark the a necessary condition for the theorem to hold is that $\Psi(x) < 1$ for all $x < 1$. Under this condition, however, the entropy bounds obtained in Section 6 would fail to hold, so some more restrictive estimates are fundamental for the current proof to work. The theorem might still be true with only the above condition, although the almost sure convergence might have to be replaced by convergence in probability.

Theorem 1.1 implies in particular that the max-2 process and the min-2 process have empirical interval distributions that converge, regardless the starting configuration, to a limit after rescaling (see Figure 1). This theorem also covers the analogous max-k processes and min-k processes for natural numbers k, defined by first choosing k points and then selecting the point in the largest or smallest interval respectively.



FIGURE 1. Empirical density of interval lengths in simulation of max-10, max-2, uniform, min-2 and min-5 processes with 10^9 points. For the plot, the x-axis has been discretized into 1024 equally sized bins.

We also study properties of the the limiting distribution $F = F^{\Psi}$. It is shown to be characterized by the following integro-differential equation

$$F'(x) = x \int_x^{\infty} \frac{1}{z}\, d\Psi(F(z)),$$

which allows us to derive tail estimates for many choices of Ψ. Note that $f^{\Psi}(x) = F'(x)/x$ is the density of the (non-size-biased) empirical distribution. For the max-k process, it is shown that $f^{\Psi}(x) \sim C_k e^{-kx}$ as $x \to \infty$ for some (implicit) C_k, while for the min-k process the tail satisfies $f^{\Psi}(x) \sim (c_k/(k-1))x^{-2-1/(k-1)}$ for some explicit c_k which satisfies $c_k \to 1$ as $k \to \infty$. See Propositions 8.2 and 8.4 for more precise statements. For comparison, in the uniform process, it is a a classical theorem of [Wei55] that the limiting interval distribution is the exponential distribution of parameter 1. Theorem 1.1 gives a new, complete proof of this fact. Many other precise results exist for the uniform splitting model, see for example [Dev81, Dev82, Deh82].

Additionally, this theorem should be compared to results for the *Kakutani interval splitting procedure* (see Lootgieter [Loo77], van Zwet [vZ78] and Slud [Slu78] for results and further background on this process; note the correction [Slu82] to the latter paper). In its simplest form, this can be described by always taking ℓ_n to be the largest interval and then subdividing this interval by a uniformly chosen point. Alternatively, it can be defined by letting $\Psi(u) = \mathbf{1}\{u \geq 1\}$ in the above definition (this case is not covered by Theorem 1.1, but the proof could be adapted). By a theorem of Pyke [Pyk80], the interval distribution of the Kakutani procedure converges to a Unif$[0, 2]$ variable. Indeed, we can see that the max-k process for large k resembles the Kakutani process more and more, and in fact F^{u^k} converges

as $k \to \infty$ to the function $F^U(x) = x^2/4 \wedge 1$, which is the size-biased distribution function of a Unif$[0,2]$ variable (see Proposition 8.6).

Methodology. We begin by embedding the discrete-time process $D_n(x)$ into a continuous time process $A_t(x)$ in such a way that $n \approx e^t$. This continuous time process A_t essentially evolves according to a stochastic evolution equation

$$\partial_t A_t(x) = -x\partial_x A_t(x) + x^2 \int_x^\infty \frac{1}{y} d\Psi(A_t(y)) + \dot{M}_t(x) \tag{1}$$

for some centered noise $M_t(x)$. This equation is both nonlinear and nonlocal, and thus it requires very specialized analysis. First off, we transform the problem to studying an integrated form of the evolution, given by

$$A_t(x) = A_0(e^{-t}x) + \int_0^t (e^{s-t}x)^2 \left[\int_{e^{s-t}x}^\infty \frac{1}{z} d\Psi(A_s(z))\right] ds + M_t(x).$$

This allows to us to write $\boldsymbol{A} = \mathscr{S}^\Psi(\boldsymbol{A}) + \boldsymbol{M}$, with $\mathscr{S}^\Psi$ an operator acting on time-indexed distributions (here and throughout, we use boldface letters to denote function-valued processes indexed by time). Fixed points of $\mathscr{S}^\Psi$ solve the following deterministic evolution equation:

$$F_t(x) = F_0(e^{-t}x) + \int_0^t (e^{s-t}x)^2 \left[\int_{e^{s-t}x}^\infty \frac{1}{z} d\Psi(F_s(z))\right] ds. \tag{2}$$

Second, we show that (2) has strong ergodicity properties. The key to this is the following carefully selected norm,

$$\|f\|_{x^{-2}} = \int_0^\infty x^{-2}|f(x)|\,dx,$$

with respect to which the evolution operator associated to (2) quite surprisingly turns out to be a contraction (see Proposition 3.4). This assures that there is a unique distribution F^Ψ so that for any starting distribution, the large-time limit of the evolution is F^Ψ (Lemma 3.5).

Third, we show how for any Ψ satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1, we can control the entropy of the size-biased empirical interval distribution. The aim of bounding the entropy is to establish tightness of the family of distribution functions $\{A_t\}_{t\geq 0}$. One ingredient for this is an estimate for the size of the largest interval, which is shown to be smaller than $n^{-\alpha}$ for large n, for every $\alpha < (\kappa_\Psi + 1)^{-1}$ (and under more restrictive conditions on Ψ, for every $\alpha < \kappa_\Psi^{-1}$). We obtain these estimates by comparing the Ψ-process with the Kakutani process or the uniform process.

Finally, in order to show that A_t converges to F^Ψ despite the presence of noise, we adapt the Kushner–Clark [KC78] method, which was developed for the study of stochastic approximation algorithms. To do so, we show that the sequence of shifted evolutions $A_t^{(n)} = A_{t+n}$ is almost surely precompact in a suitable topology, using the previously established tightness of the family $\{A_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ together with an equicontinuity result. We then show that the limit points of this sequence are fixed points of the operator $\mathscr{S}^\Psi$, from which we can conclude that the unique limit is the stationary evolution $\boldsymbol{F}^* \equiv F^\Psi$. This yields almost sure convergence of the stochastic evolution $\boldsymbol{A}$.

We remark that there exists a fairly extensive literature dealing with stochastic approximation in infinite-dimensional spaces (see e.g. [Wal77, Yin92, CCZ13] and



FIGURE 2. Empirical density of points in the unit interval in simulation of max-2, uniform and min-2 processes with 10^6 points (left) and 10^9 points (right). For the plot, the x-axis has been discretized into 128 equally sized bins.

the references therein). However, the results obtained there seem to be substantially too restrictive to apply to our setting. The most serious difficulty arises from the fact that the norm $\|\cdot\|_{x^{-2}}$, which is our only tool to study convergence of the (deterministic) evolution, is very sensitive to perturbations, due to the absolute value appearing inside the integral. As a consequence, we are not able to directly control the stochastic evolution $\boldsymbol{A}$ or the noise $\boldsymbol{M}$ in terms of this norm. For this reason, our proof of Theorem 1.1 does not yield any bounds on the rate of convergence of D_n to F^{Ψ}, although simulations indicate that this convergence is quite fast, possibly polynomial in n (see Figure 1, in which the noise is completely invisible despite the high resolution of the data).

Discussion. The max-k choice and min-k choice models can be considered variants of the *Achlioptas* processes, which have seen considerable attention in the random graph literature [ABKU99, ADS09, RW12]. The first major appearance of this process is in [ABKU99] in the computer science literature. If one throws n balls into n bins, each uniformly at random, it is a simple exercise to see the maximum load (i.e. the number of balls in the fullest bin) is about $\log n$. In Azar et al. n balls are thrown into n bins, but for each ball, two bins are selected uniformly at random and the ball is placed in the bin with fewer balls. This is seen to reduce the maximal number of balls in a bin to $\log_2 \log n$, a considerable decrease from the same model without the two choices. If one instead chooses the bin with the larger load, the

maximal load increases to about $2\log n$ (see [DKM07]). Similar considerations by the second author and Malyshkin [MP13] show that the same conclusions hold in the min-choice case if the bins are sampled in a size-biased manner.

It is not clear to us whether there is a direct correspondence between the balls-and-bins model and our interval splitting process. However, in both models, the evolution of the large objects (the bins with high load/the large intervals) is simply accelerated by a factor of 2 in the max-version, whereas it is substantially slowed down in the min-version. To wit, in the uniform splitting model, the size of the largest interval is $\approx \log n/n$ [Dar53, Whi97]. In the max-2 process, the tail of the interval distribution is of order e^{-2x}, which suggests that the size of the largest interval is $\approx \frac{1}{2}\log n/n$. In the min-2 process on the other hand, the size of the largest interval is $n^{-1/2+o(1)}$ and thus on a completely different scale, mirroring what occurs in the balls-and-bins model (without size biasing).

There are many other interval subdivision models that are related directly or indirectly to these models. Brennan and Durrett [BD87] study a model where each interval evolves independently, and an interval of length L is subdivided with rate L^α. This is exactly the uniform process in the case $\alpha = 1$, and they show that the empirical interval distribution converges to a distribution with density proportional to e^{-y^α}. This work in turns sits within the larger class of fragmentation processes, see [Ber06] for a comprehensive account. Another, fairly different, interval split-merge model arises in the study of compositions of random transpositions, see [DMWZZ04, Sch05].

Open questions. As mentioned above, Theorem 1.1 does not yield any information about the rate of convergence to the limiting interval distribution which therefore remains an open question. One could even expect a central limit theorem to hold.

The size of the largest interval in the process is a natural object to study. Here, we only have very crude estimates (see Section 5). One might expect that its magnitude can be deduced from the limiting interval distribution: it should be of the order of $\overline{F}^{-1}(1/n)/n$, where $\overline{F}$ is the tail of the (non-size-biased) limiting interval distribution.

Another interesting open problem is to study the spatial positions of the points in the Ψ-process. We believe that the limiting empirical distribution is always uniform (although the min-k choice process displays extremely slow convergence, see Figure 1). This is indeed the case for the above-mentioned Kakutani process [Loo77, vZ78, Slu78], but the methods do not carry over. One of the motivations for proving Theorem 1.1 is that it could help resolve that question. We are actively working on this problem.

The problem of the spatial positions of the points originates with a problem posed to us by I. Benjamini about a similar, albeit technically quite different problem. Once again, consider throwing pairs of points on the circle. Now, keep the point that is *farthest* from other points and discard the point which is closest. One can similarly define a process that does the reverse. The evolution of the interval distribution in this case now becomes substantially more complicated, and simulations give very strong evidence that the limiting interval distributions are different.

Overview of the article. In Section 2, we introduce the main objects dealt with in this paper, among them a continuous version of the interval splitting process,

the above-mentioned operator $\mathscr{S}^\Psi$ and some functional spaces. Some fundamental properties of $\mathscr{S}^\Psi$ are established in Section 3. Section 4 proves the important Proposition 3.4, which is the key to the existence of a unique limit F^Ψ to the evolution equation. In Section 5, we turn to the stochastic evolution and give bounds for the size of the largest interval. In Section 6, we establish entropy bounds on the stochastic evolution used to yield tightness. Section 7 then uses the results of the previous sections to prove convergence of the stochastic evolution to a deterministic limit, i.e. Theorem 1.1. Finally, Section 8 contains several results about properties of the limiting distribution.

Acknowledgements. We are grateful to Itai Benjamini, who asked us a question which motivated this research. The computer simulations have been dutifully executed by the cluster of the Weizmann Institute of Science, Department of Mathematics and Computer Science. Node `n68` in particular has done a tremendous job and is hereby thanked.

2. Definitions

In this section, we define the objects used in this article. All notation used in later sections is either defined there or in this section.

Throughout the paper, we will assume that Ψ is the cumulative distribution function of a probability measure on $(0,1]$. Whenever we enforce stronger assumptions on Ψ, we will state them explicitly. The following two assumptions will appear quite often:

(C) Ψ is continuous.

(D) There exist $c>0$ and $\kappa_\Psi \in [1,\infty)$, such that $1-\Psi(u) \geq c(1-u)^{\kappa_\Psi}$ for all $u \in (0,1)$.

We define a continuous version of the Ψ-process which is technically convenient to work with. Let Π be a Poisson random measure on $[0,\infty)\times[0,1]^2$ with intensity $e^t dt \otimes d\Psi(u) \otimes dv$. We define a random family of distribution functions $(\widetilde{A}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ as follows: set $\ell_t(u) := \widetilde{A}_{t-}^{-1}(u)$ and define

$$\widetilde{A}_t(x) = \widetilde{A}_0(x) + \sum_{(s,u,v)\in\Pi,\, s\leq t} B(s,u,v,x), \quad \text{with} \tag{3}$$

$$B(s,u,v,x) = \ell_s(u)\mathbf{1}\left\{\ell_s(u) > x\right\} \times \left(v\mathbf{1}\left\{\ell_s(u)v \leq x\right\} + (1-v)\mathbf{1}\left\{\ell_s(u)(1-v)\leq x\right\}\right),$$

Note that by definition, $\widetilde{A}_t(x)$ is increasing in t.

The relation between the process $(\widetilde{A}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ and the sequence $(\widetilde{D}_n)_{n\geq 0}$ defined in the introduction is the following: if we set $\widetilde{A}_0 = \widetilde{D}_0$, then with τ_n the time at which the n-th point appears in the Poisson process Π, we have $(\widetilde{A}_{\tau_n})_{n\geq 0}$ has the same distribution as $(\widetilde{D}_n)_{n\geq 0}$.

For every bounded Borel function f, we have by definition

$$\int_0^1 f(\ell_t(u))\, d\Psi(u) = \int_0^1 f(\widetilde{A}_{t-}^{-1}(u))\, d\Psi(u).$$

Changing variables in the integral on the right yields the following useful formula:

$$\int_0^1 f(\ell_t(u))\, d\Psi(u) = \int_0^\infty f(z)\, d\Psi(\widetilde{A}_{t-}(z)). \tag{4}$$

Define the filtration $\mathscr{F} = (\mathscr{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$, where $\mathscr{F}_t = \sigma(\Pi|_{[0,t]\times[0,1]^2})$. For every x, the process $(\widetilde{A}_t(x))_{t\geq 0}$ is a semimartingale with respect to $\mathscr{F}$. In order to obtain its semimartingale decomposition, we need to calculate first and second moments of $B(t,u,v,x)$ conditioned on $\mathscr{F}_{t-}$. By symmetry, we have for every t and x,

$$\begin{aligned}\iint B(t,u,v,x)\,d\Psi(u)\,dv &= \int_0^1 \ell_s(u)\mathbf{1}\left\{\ell_s(u) > x\right\} 2\int_0^{x/\ell_s(u)} v\,dv\,d\Psi(u)\\ &= x^2\int_0^1 \frac{1}{\ell_s(u)}\mathbf{1}\left\{\ell_s(u) > x\right\}\,d\Psi(u),\end{aligned}$$

so that by (4),

$$\iint B(t,u,v,x)\,d\Psi(u)\,dv = x^2\int_x^\infty \frac{1}{z}\,d\Psi(\widetilde{A}_{t-}(z)). \tag{5}$$

We therefore have for every $x \geq 0$ the following semimartingale decomposition of $(\widetilde{A}_t(x))_{t\geq 0}$:

$$\widetilde{A}_t(x) = \widetilde{A}_0(x) + \int_0^t e^s x^2\left[\int_x^\infty \frac{1}{z} d\Psi(\widetilde{A}_s(z))\right]\,ds + \widetilde{M}_t(x),$$

for some martingale $\widetilde{M}_t(x)$, whose quadratic variation will be calculated in Section 7.

We now define $A_t(x) = \widetilde{A}_t(e^{-t}x)$, such that

$$A_t(x) = \widetilde{A}_0(e^{-t}x) + \int_0^t (e^{s-t}x)^2\left[\int_{e^{s-t}x}^\infty \frac{1}{z} d\Psi(\widetilde{A}_s(z))\right]\,ds + M_t(x),$$

with $M_t(x) = \widetilde{M}_t(e^{-t}x)$. We will see in Section 7, that as $t\to\infty$, M_t becomes vanishingly small in an appropriate norm on functions. Thus, the function A_t evolves to resemble a fixed point of a certain evolution, which we will now formalize.

Define the space L^1_{loc} of locally integrable functions $f : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$, endow with the following canonical metric $d_{L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}}$,

$$d_{L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}}(f,g) = \sum_{k=1}^\infty 2^{-k} \wedge \int_0^k |f(x) - g(x)|\,dx,$$

which makes L^1_{loc} into a complete separable metric space. Define the subspace $\mathcal{D} \subset L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}$ of subdistribution functions by

$$\mathcal{D} = \left\{F : [0,\infty] \to [0,1],\ \text{càdlàg, increasing}\right\}.$$

Recall that for $F, F_1, F_2, \ldots \in \mathcal{D}$, $F_n \to F$ w.r.t. $d_{L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}}$ if and only if $F_n(x) \to F(x)$ at every point of continuity x of F. In particular, $\mathcal{D}$ is a compact subset of L^1_{loc} by Helly's selection theorem.

We will later make extensive use of the following quantity. Define for $f \in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}$:

$$\|f\|_{x^{-2}} = \int_0^\infty x^{-2}|f(x)|\,dx \in [0,\infty].$$

Then define a subspace $\mathcal{D}_1 \subset \mathcal{D}$ by

$$\mathcal{D}_1 = \left\{F \in \mathcal{D} : \|F\|_{x^{-2}} \leq 1\right\}.$$

It is easily verified that these are exactly the distribution functions of size-biased transforms of subprobability measures with mean at most 1. To wit, for such a measure μ we may write $F(x) = \int_0^x z\,d\mu(z)$ and so calculate

$$\int_0^\infty x^{-2}\left[\int_0^x z\,d\mu(z)\right]dx = \int_0^\infty \left[\int_z^\infty x^{-2}\,dx\right] z\,d\mu(z) = \int_0^\infty d\mu(z) \leq 1. \tag{6}$$

Using Fatou's lemma, it is easily checked that $\mathcal{D}_1$ is a closed subset of $\mathcal{D}$ with respect to the metric $d_{L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}}$. Note that the topology induced on $\mathcal{D}_1$ is equivalent to the topology induced by the vague convergence of the underlying measures.

We define a second metric on $\mathcal{D}_1$ by $d_{x^{-2}}(F,G) = \|F-G\|_{x^{-2}}$. Note that by definition, $\|F\|_{x^{-2}} \leq 1$ for every $F \in \mathcal{D}$, whence

$$d_{x^{-2}}(F,G) \leq \|F\|_{x^{-2}} + \|G\|_{x^{-2}} \leq 2, \quad \forall F,G \in \mathcal{D}_1. \tag{7}$$

Lemma 2.1. *The metric space $(\mathcal{D}_1, d_{x^{-2}})$ is complete.*

Proof. Note that for any $F,G \in \mathcal{D}_1$, we have that for any $K \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$d_{L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}}(F,G) \leq 2^{-K} + \int_0^K |F(x)-G(x)|\,dx \leq 2^{-K} + K^2 d_{x^{-2}}(F,G). \tag{8}$$

Hence if $F_n \in \mathcal{D}_1$ is Cauchy w.r.t $d_{x^{-2}}$, it is also Cauchy w.r.t $d_{L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}}$. In particular, given a $d_{x^{-2}}$-Cauchy sequence $(F_n)_{n\geq 0} \in \mathcal{D}_1$, we have by the completeness of $\mathcal{D}_1$ that there is an $F \in \mathcal{D}_1$ so that $d_{L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}}(F_n,F) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. In particular, $F_m \to F$ pointwise almost everywhere as $m \to \infty$ (see above). Fatou's lemma now yields for every $n \geq 0$, $d_{x^{-2}}(F_n,F) \leq \liminf_{m\to\infty} d_{x^{-2}}(F_n,F_m)$. Since $(F_n)_{n\geq 0}$ is a $d_{x^{-2}}$-Cauchy sequence, this gives $d_{x^{-2}}(F_n,F) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, which finishes the proof. □

We now define the space $\mathcal{B}([0,\infty), L^1_{\mathrm{loc}})$ of measurable maps from $[0,\infty)$ to L^1_{loc}. Elements of this space will always be denoted by boldface characters when no index is present, such as $\boldsymbol{F} = (F_t)_{t\geq 0}$. We endow this space with the topology of locally uniform convergence, which we denote by the symbol $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{X}}$. Then $\boldsymbol{F}^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{X}} \boldsymbol{F}$ as $n \to \infty$ if and only if for all compact $K \subseteq [0,\infty)$ and all $t > 0$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{0\leq s\leq t} \int_K |F_s^{(n)}(x) - F_s(x)|\,dx = 0.$$

The subspaces $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}_1 \subset \mathcal{B}([0,\infty), L^1_{\mathrm{loc}})$ are defined by

$$\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{B}([0,\infty), \mathcal{D}), \quad \mathcal{X}_1 = \mathcal{B}([0,\infty), \mathcal{D}_1) \subset \mathcal{X}.$$

Since $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}_1$ are closed subsets of L^1_{loc}, $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{X}_1$ are closed subsets of $B([0,\infty), L^1_{\mathrm{loc}})$. Note that $\boldsymbol{A}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{A}} \in \mathcal{X}$.

The spaces of continuous maps $C([0,\infty), \mathcal{D})$ and $C([0,\infty), L^1_{\mathrm{loc}})$ are closed subsets of $\mathcal{X}$ and $B([0,\infty), L^1_{\mathrm{loc}})$, respectively. Furthermore, the topology on these spaces can be metrized to make them complete separable metric spaces.

At last, between $\mathcal{X}$ and $C([0,\infty), L^1_{\mathrm{loc}})$, we define the operator $\mathscr{S}^\Psi$ given by

$$\mathscr{S}^\Psi(\boldsymbol{F})_t(x) = F_0(e^{-t}x) + \int_0^t (e^{s-t}x)^2 \left[\int_{e^{s-t}x}^\infty \frac{1}{z} d\Psi(F_s(z))\right] ds,$$

and note that it allows us to write $\boldsymbol{A} = \mathscr{S}^\Psi(\boldsymbol{A}) + \boldsymbol{M}$. We will be interested in the following family of fixed points of the operator $\mathscr{S}^\Psi$:

$$\mathfrak{F} = \{\boldsymbol{F} \in \mathcal{X}_1 : \boldsymbol{F} = \mathscr{S}^\Psi(\boldsymbol{F}), \forall t \geq 0 : F_t(+\infty) = 1 \text{ and } \{F_t\}_{t\geq 0} \text{ tight.}\},$$

Here, we recall that a family of distribution functions $\{F_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in X}$ on $[0,\infty)$ is tight if for all $\epsilon > 0$, there is an $N > 0$ sufficiently large that $F_\alpha(N) > 1 - \epsilon$.

3. Properties of the operator $\mathscr{S}^\Psi$

We will need to study $\mathfrak{F}$ in the abstract, and one immediate concern about $\mathfrak{F}$ is that it could be empty. As a consequence of various compactness properties, we will use the stochastic evolution $\boldsymbol{A}$ to construct such fixed points for any continuous Ψ in Section 7, although they could also be constructed through plain discretization. For the moment, we will suppose $\mathfrak{F}$ is nonempty to establish some important properties of $\mathscr{S}^\Psi$ and elements of $\mathfrak{F}$.

Fixed points in $\mathfrak{F}$ naturally admit a type of semigroup structure. This in turn follows from the structure of $\mathscr{S}^\Psi$. To expose these properties, define the operator semigroup $T_t : L^1_{\mathrm{loc}} \to L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}$ by $T_t F(x) = F(e^{-t}x)$ and the operator $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{D} \to L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}$ by $\mathcal{A}F(x) = x^2 \int_x^\infty z^{-1}\, d\Psi(F(z))$. Then, for every $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathscr{S}^\Psi(\boldsymbol{F})_t = T_t F_0 + \int_0^t T_{t-s}\mathcal{A}F_s\, ds. \tag{9}$$

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose $\boldsymbol{F} \in \mathcal{X}$. Define $\boldsymbol{G} = \boldsymbol{F} - \mathscr{S}^\Psi(\boldsymbol{F})$, such that $\boldsymbol{G}$ is a measurable function from $[0,\infty)$ to L^1_{loc}. Define $G^{(s)}_t = G_{s+t} - T_t G_s$ and $F^{(s)}_t = F_{s+t}$ for every $s, t \geq 0$. Then $\boldsymbol{F}^{(s)} = \mathscr{S}^\Psi(\boldsymbol{F}^{(s)}) + \boldsymbol{G}^{(s)}$.*

Proof. By (9), we have for every $s, t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{S}^\Psi(\boldsymbol{F}^{(s)})_t &= T_t F^{(s)}_0 + \int_0^t T_{t-r}\mathcal{A}F^{(s)}_r\, dr \\
&= T_t F_s + \int_s^{s+t} T_{s+t-r}\mathcal{A}F_r\, dr \\
&= T_t(\mathscr{S}^\Psi(\boldsymbol{F})_s + G_s) + \int_s^{s+t} T_{s+t-r}\mathcal{A}F_r\, dr \\
&= T_t(T_s F_0 + \int_0^s T_{s-r}\mathcal{A}F_r\, dr) + T_t G_s + \int_s^{s+t} T_{s+t-r}\mathcal{A}F_r\, dr \\
&= T_{s+t}F_0 + \int_0^{s+t} T_{s+t-r}\mathcal{A}F_r\, dr + T_t G_s \\
&= \mathscr{S}^\Psi(\boldsymbol{F})_{t+s} + T_t G_s.
\end{aligned}$$

By definition of $\boldsymbol{G}$ and $\boldsymbol{G}^{(s)}$, this finally yields for every $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathscr{S}^\Psi(\boldsymbol{F}^{(s)})_t + \boldsymbol{G}^{(s)}_t = \mathscr{S}^\Psi(\boldsymbol{F})_{s+t} + T_t G_s + G_{s+t} - T_t G_s = F_{s+t} = F^{(s)}_t,$$

which implies that $\boldsymbol{F}^{(s)} = \mathscr{S}^\Psi(\boldsymbol{F}^{(s)}) + \boldsymbol{G}^{(s)}$. □

Corollary 3.2. *$\boldsymbol{F} \in \mathfrak{F}$ implies that $\boldsymbol{F}^{(s)}$ in $\mathfrak{F}$ for every $s \geq 0$, where $F^{(s)}_t = F_{s+t}$ for every $t \geq 0$.*

One critical property of the operator $\mathscr{S}^\Psi$ is that it is continuous with respect to the topologies defined in the previous section.

Lemma 3.3. *Assume (C). Then $\mathscr{S}^\Psi : \mathcal{X} \to C([0,\infty), L^1_{loc})$ is continuous.*

Proof. Let $\boldsymbol{F}, \boldsymbol{G} \in \mathcal{X}$. Fix a large $K > 0$. Then we have

$$\int_0^K \left|\mathscr{S}^\Psi(\boldsymbol{F})_t(x) - \mathscr{S}^\Psi(\boldsymbol{G})_t(x)\right| \, dx$$

$$\leq \int_0^K \left|F_0(e^{-t}x) - G_0(e^{-t}x)\right| \, dx$$

$$+ \int_0^K \int_0^t (e^{s-t}x)^2 \left| \int_{e^{s-t}x}^\infty \frac{1}{z}(d\Psi(F_s(z)) - d\Psi(G_s(z)))\right| \, dsdx.$$

The first of these two integrals clearly goes to 0 uniformly on compact sets of t if $\boldsymbol{F} \overset{\mathcal{X}}{\to} \boldsymbol{G}$, since for every $t \geq 0$, we have

$$\int_0^K \left|F_0(e^{-t}x) - G_0(e^{-t}x)\right| \, dx \leq e^t \int_0^K |F_0(x) - G_0(x)| \, dx,$$

and the integral on the right-hand side goes to 0 by the definition of the convergence $\boldsymbol{F} \overset{\mathcal{X}}{\to} \boldsymbol{G}$. We expand the interior of the second integral by parts so that for every x which is a point of continuity of F_s and G_s,

$$\left| \int_{e^{s-t}x}^\infty \frac{1}{z}(d\Psi(F_s(z)) - d\Psi(G_s(z)))\right|$$

$$\leq \frac{|\Psi(F_s(e^{s-t}x)) - \Psi(G_s(e^{s-t}x))|}{e^{s-t}x}$$

$$+ \int_{e^{s-t}x}^\infty \left| \frac{\Psi(F_s(z)) - \Psi(G_s(z))}{z^2}\right| \, dz.$$

We handle the contribution of each of these pieces separately. For the first integral, we would like to show that for any $T > 0$, if $\boldsymbol{F} \overset{\mathcal{X}}{\to} \boldsymbol{G}$,

$$I_1 := \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_0^K \int_0^t (e^{s-t}x)^2 \frac{|\Psi(F_s(e^{s-t}x)) - \Psi(G_s(e^{s-t}x))|}{e^{s-t}x} \, dsdx \to 0.$$

We reverse the order of integration, and change the integral to be over $y = e^{s-t}x$, so that this is equivalent to

$$I_1 = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int_0^t \int_0^{e^{s-t}K} y \, |\Psi(F_s(y)) - \Psi(G_s(y))| \, dsdy.$$

Noting that $s - t \leq 0$, we may use the non-negativity of the integrand to conclude that

$$I_1 \leq K \int_0^T \int_0^K |\Psi(F_s(y)) - \Psi(G_s(y))| \, dsdy.$$

For some bounded set V of $\mathbb{R}^m$, recall that a sequence of measurable functions $f_n : V \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to converge to 0 in measure if for all $\epsilon > 0$, $\lambda\{x \, : \, |f_n| > \epsilon\} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ where λ is Lebesgue measure. For a sequence of bounded functions, convergence in measure is equivalent to L^1 convergence to 0 on V.

Thus, under the assumption that $\boldsymbol{F} \overset{\mathcal{X}}{\to} \boldsymbol{G}$, for any bounded set of (s, y) in $[0, \infty)^2$, it follows that $F_s(y) - G_s(y)$ converges to 0 in measure. From the uniform continuity of Ψ, it follows immediately that $\Psi(F_s(y)) - \Psi(G_s(y))$ converges to 0 in measure. Thus, from the boundedness of the integrand, we get that if $\boldsymbol{F} \overset{\mathcal{X}}{\to} \boldsymbol{G}$, $I_1 \to 0$.

We then truncate the second integral. As before, we would like to show that if $\boldsymbol{F} \overset{\mathcal{X}}{\to} \boldsymbol{G}$,

$$I_2 := \sup_{0 \le t \le T} \int_0^K \int_0^t (e^{s-t}x)^2 \int_{e^{s-t}x}^\infty \left| \frac{\Psi(F_s(z)) - \Psi(G_s(z))}{z^2} \right| dz\, ds dx \to 0. \tag{10}$$

Fix some $M > K$, then we have that

$$\int_{e^{s-t}x}^\infty \left| \frac{\Psi(F_s(z)) - \Psi(G_s(z))}{z^2} \right| dz. \\ \le \frac{2}{M} + \frac{1}{(e^{s-t}x)^2} \int_0^M |\Psi(F_s(z)) - \Psi(G_s(z))|\, dz.$$

Applying this bound to (10), we get that there is a constant $C_{K,T}$ so that

$$I_2 \le \frac{C_{K,T}}{M} + K \int_0^T \int_0^M \left| \frac{\Psi(F_s(z)) - \Psi(G_s(z))}{z^2} \right| dz\, ds.$$

By the same argument used for I_1, if $\boldsymbol{F} \overset{\mathcal{X}}{\to} \boldsymbol{G}$, then for each fixed M, this integral goes to 0. As we may then make M as small as we like, we get that $I_2 \to 0$ as well. □

Our goal is ultimately to understand the large t behavior of a function $\boldsymbol{F} \in \mathfrak{F}$. This in essence requires us to show that the evolution operator associated to (1) has a type of ergodicity. This is achieved by the following proposition:

Proposition 3.4. *For all $\boldsymbol{F}, \boldsymbol{G} \in \mathfrak{F}$, for every $t \ge 0$, we have*

$$\|F_t - G_t\|_{x^{-2}} \le e^{-t} \|F_0 - G_0\|_{x^{-2}}.$$

We delay the proof of this proposition until the next section. The most central consequence of this proposition is that all $\boldsymbol{F} \in \mathfrak{F}$ share a common large t limit.

Lemma 3.5. *Assume (C) and $\mathfrak{F} \neq \emptyset$. Then there is a unique distribution function $F^\Psi \in \mathcal{D}_1$ so that for any $\boldsymbol{F} \in \mathfrak{F}$*

$$\left\|F_t - F^\Psi\right\|_{x^{-2}} \le 2e^{-t}, \quad \forall t \ge 0.$$

Furthermore, setting $\boldsymbol{F}^* \equiv F^\Psi$, then $\boldsymbol{F}^* \in \mathfrak{F}$. Finally, F^Ψ is absolutely continuous and satisfies the equation

$$(F^\Psi)'(x) = x \int_x^\infty \frac{1}{z}\, d\Psi(F^\Psi(z)). \tag{11}$$

almost everywhere. In particular, $\left\|F^\Psi\right\|_{x^{-2}} = 1$ and the Lebesgue–Stieltjes measure $\frac{1}{x} dF^\Psi(x)$ is a probability measure with mean 1.

Proof. By assumption, there exists $\boldsymbol{F} \in \mathfrak{F}$, i.e. a fixed point of the operator $\mathscr{S}^\Psi$. We claim that the (transfinite) sequence $(F_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is Cauchy in $(\mathcal{D}_1, d_{x^{-2}})$. For this, let $s \leq t$. By Corollary 3.2, $\boldsymbol{F}^{(t-s)} \in \mathfrak{F}$ as well. Proposition 3.4 and (7) then imply,

$$\|F_s - F_t\|_{x^{-2}} = \left\|F_s - F_s^{(t-s)}\right\|_{x^{-2}} \leq e^{-s} \left\|F_0 - F_0^{(t-s)}\right\|_{x^{-2}} \leq 2e^{-s}.$$

By Lemma 2.1, the space $\mathcal{D}_1$ is complete under the metric $d_{x^{-2}}$, which yields existence of an $F \in \mathcal{D}_1$ so that $\|F_t - F\|_{x^{-2}} \leq 2e^{-t}$ for every $t \geq 0$. Suppose that $\boldsymbol{G}$ is another element of $\mathfrak{F}$. Then the same argument shows that there is a G so that $\|G_t - G\|_{x^{-2}} \leq 2e^{-t}$ for every $t \geq 0$. Then, however, it follows that for any $t \geq 0$,

$$d_{x^{-2}}(F, G) \leq d_{x^{-2}}(F, G_t) + d_{x^{-2}}(F_t, G_t) + d_{x^{-2}}(G_t, G) \leq 6e^{-t}.$$

Hence, it follows that $F = G$ and so the limit function $F = F^\Psi$ is unique. Further, we have that F^Ψ is a distribution function on account of the tightness of the family $\{F_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ by the definition of $\mathfrak{F}$. As for the stationary evolution, we set $F_t^* = F^\Psi$ for all $t \geq 0$. We need only check that this is indeed a fixed point. Note that $\boldsymbol{F}^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{X}} \boldsymbol{F}^*$ as $n \to \infty$ and hence by the continuity of $\mathscr{S}^\Psi$ (Lemma 3.3) we may take limits on both sides of the equation $\boldsymbol{F}^{(n)} = \mathscr{S}^\Psi(\boldsymbol{F}^{(n)})$ to conclude that $\boldsymbol{F}^* = \mathscr{S}^\Psi(\boldsymbol{F}^*)$.

Finally, we check the properties of F^Ψ. We write from now on $F = F^\Psi$. From the stationarity of $\boldsymbol{F}^*$, we get for every $t \geq 0$,

$$F(x) = F(e^{-t}x) + \int_0^t (e^{s-t}x)^2 \left[\int_{e^{s-t}x}^\infty \frac{1}{z} d\Psi(F(z))\right] ds. \tag{12}$$

The integral is continuous in t for every x, and the left hand side is continuous in t as well. Thus, $F(e^{-t}x)$ is continuous in t and hence F is continuous. Now let x be a point of continuity of Ψ. The integral in the above equation is then continuously differentiable in t with derivative $(e^{-t}x)^2 \int_{e^{-t}x}^\infty \frac{1}{z} d\Psi(F(z))$. This gives,

$$\lim_{h\downarrow 0} \frac{F(x-h) - F(x)}{h} = \lim_{t\downarrow 0} \frac{F(e^{-t}x) - F(x)}{tx} = -x \int_x^\infty \frac{1}{z} d\Psi(F(z)).$$

Furthermore, replacing x by xe^t in (12) and applying the same reasoning yields

$$\lim_{h\downarrow 0} \frac{F(x+h) - F(x)}{h} = x \int_x^\infty \frac{1}{z} d\Psi(F(z)).$$

The last two equations now imply that at every point of continuity x of Ψ, F is differentiable and satisfies (11). Furthermore, the above reasoning also yields that F admits a right- and left- derivative everywhere. This now implies that F is absolutely continuous and satisfies (11) almost everywhere.

For the last statements, we divide (11) by x and integrate, so that, by the Fubini–Tonelli theorem,

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{F'(x)}{x}\, dx = \int_0^\infty \left[\int_x^\infty \frac{1}{z}\, d\Psi(F(z))\right] dx = \int_0^\infty d\Psi(F(z)) = 1.$$

This implies that the Lebesgue–Stieltjes measure $\frac{1}{x} dF^\Psi(x)$ is a probability measure with mean 1. Furthermore, since

$$\lim_{y\to 0} \frac{F(y)}{y} = \lim_{y\to 0} \frac{1}{y} \int_0^y F'(x)\, dx \leq \lim_{y\to 0} \int_0^y \frac{F'(x)}{x}\, dx = 0,$$

an integration by parts gives

$$1 = \int_0^\infty \frac{F'(x)}{x}\,dx = \int_0^\infty \frac{F(x)}{x^2}\,dx.$$

This finishes the proof of the lemma. □

4. Proof of geometric decay of fixed points

In this section, we prove Proposition 3.4. Let $\boldsymbol{F}, \boldsymbol{G} \in \mathfrak{F}$. We want to show that for every $t \geq 0$,

$$\|F_t - G_t\|_{x^{-2}} \leq e^{-t} \|F_0 - G_0\|_{x^{-2}}\,. \tag{13}$$

We first define $\widetilde{F}_t(x) = F_t(e^t x)$ and $\widetilde{G}_t(x) = G_t(e^t x)$. Then $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{F}} = \widetilde{\mathscr{S}^\Psi}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{F}})$ and $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{G}} = \widetilde{\mathscr{S}^\Psi}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{G}})$, where the operator $\widetilde{\mathscr{S}^\Psi}$ is defined through

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{S}^\Psi}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{F}})_t(x) = \widetilde{F}_0(x) + \int_0^t e^s x^2 \left[\int_x^\infty \frac{1}{z} d\Psi(\widetilde{F}_s(z))\right] ds.$$

In particular, for every $x \geq 0$, the map $t \mapsto \widetilde{\mathscr{S}^\Psi}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{F}})_t(x)$ is differentiable for (Lebesgue-)almost every $t \geq 0$ and its derivative is given by

$$\partial_t \widetilde{\mathscr{S}^\Psi}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{F}})_t(x) = e^t x^2 \int_x^\infty \frac{1}{z} d\Psi(\widetilde{F}_t(z)). \tag{14}$$

Since $\widetilde{F}_t$ is càdlàg for every t, the above formula then also holds jointly in x, for almost every $t \geq 0$.

We now claim the following:

Lemma 4.1. *For every $t \geq 0$, we have*

$$\left\|\widetilde{F}_t - \widetilde{G}_t\right\|_{x^{-2}} \leq \left\|\widetilde{F}_0 - \widetilde{G}_0\right\|_{x^{-2}}.$$

Proof. It is enough to show that for (Lebesgue-)almost every $t \geq 0$,

$$\partial_t \left\|\widetilde{F}_t - \widetilde{G}_t\right\|_{x^{-2}} = \int_0^\infty x^{-2} \partial_t |\widetilde{F}_t(x) - \widetilde{G}_t(x)|\,dx \leq 0. \tag{15}$$

We start from (14) and write for each $x \geq 0$ the dynamics for the difference $\widetilde{F}_t(x) - \widetilde{G}_t(x)$ as

$$\partial_t(\widetilde{F}_t(x) - \widetilde{G}_t(x)) = e^t x^2 I_t(x),$$

where

$$I_t(x) = \int_x^\infty \frac{\partial_z(\Psi(\widetilde{F}_t(z)) - \Psi(\widetilde{G}_t(z)))}{z}\,dz.$$

Multiply through both sides by $\operatorname{sgn}(\widetilde{F}_t - \widetilde{G}_t)$ to get

$$e^{-t}\partial_t|\widetilde{F}_t(x) - \widetilde{G}_t(x)| = x^2 \begin{cases} \operatorname{sgn}(\widetilde{F}_t(x) - \widetilde{G}_t(x)) I_t(x) & \text{if } \widetilde{F}_t(x) \neq \widetilde{G}_t(x) \\ |I_t(x)| & \text{if } \widetilde{F}_t(x) = \widetilde{G}_t(x). \end{cases}$$

Apply integration by parts to the integral, so that

$$I_t(x) = -x^{-1}(\Psi(\widetilde{F}_t(x)) - \Psi(\widetilde{G}_t(x))) + \int_x^\infty \frac{(\Psi(\widetilde{F}_t(z)) - \Psi(\widetilde{G}_t(z)))}{z^2}\,dz.$$

Now note that Ψ is an non-decreasing function, such that $\operatorname{sgn}(\widetilde{F}_t(x) - \widetilde{G}_t(x)) = \operatorname{sgn}(\Psi(\widetilde{F}_t(x)) - \Psi(\widetilde{G}_t(x)))$ as long as $\Psi(\widetilde{F}_t(x)) \neq \Psi(\widetilde{G}_t(x))$. The previous two equations therefore yield

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-t}\partial_t|\widetilde{F}_t(x) - \widetilde{G}_t(x)| &= -x|\Psi(\widetilde{F}_t(x)) - \Psi(\widetilde{G}_t(x))| + x^2\left|\int_x^\infty \frac{\Psi(\widetilde{F}_t(z)) - \Psi(\widetilde{G}_t(z))}{z^2}\,dz\right| \\ &\leq -x|\Psi(\widetilde{F}_t(x)) - \Psi(\widetilde{G}_t(x))| + x^2\int_x^\infty \frac{|\Psi(\widetilde{F}_t(z)) - \Psi(\widetilde{G}_t(z))|}{z^2}\,dz. \end{aligned}$$

Multiply both sides by x^{-2} and integrate in x from 0 to infinity:

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-t}\int_0^\infty x^{-2}\partial_t|\widetilde{F}_t(x) - \widetilde{G}_t(x)|\,dx \leq &-\int_0^\infty \frac{|\Psi(\widetilde{F}_t(x)) - \Psi(\widetilde{G}_t(x))|}{x}\,dx \\ &+\int_0^\infty\int_x^\infty \frac{|\Psi(\widetilde{F}_t(z)) - \Psi(\widetilde{G}_t(z))|}{z^2}\,dz\,dx. \end{aligned}$$

The magic is that the last two integrals are actually equal. By the Fubini–Tonelli theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty\int_x^\infty \frac{|\Psi(\widetilde{F}_t(z)) - \Psi(\widetilde{G}_t(z))|}{z^2}\,dz\,dx &= \int_0^\infty \frac{|\Psi(\widetilde{F}_t(z)) - \Psi(\widetilde{G}_t(z))|}{z^2}\left[\int_0^z 1\,dx\right]dz \\ &= \int_0^\infty \frac{|\Psi(\widetilde{F}_t(z)) - \Psi(\widetilde{G}_t(z))|}{z}\,dz. \end{aligned}$$

This implies (15) which concludes the proof of the lemma. □

Proof of Proposition 3.4. Recall that we have $F_t(x) = \widetilde{F}_t(e^{-t}x)$ and $G_t(x) = \widetilde{G}_t(e^{-t}x)$ for every $t \geq 0$ and $x \geq 0$. This gives for every $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_t - G_t\|_{x^{-2}} &= \int_0^\infty x^{-2}|F_t(x) - G_t(x)|\,dx \\ &= \int_0^\infty x^{-2}|\widetilde{F}_t(e^{-t}x) - \widetilde{G}_t(e^{-t}x)|\,dx \\ &= e^{-t}\int_0^\infty x^{-2}|\widetilde{F}_t(x) - \widetilde{G}_t(x)|\,dx \\ &= e^{-t}\left\|\widetilde{F}_t - \widetilde{G}_t\right\|_{x^{-2}}. \end{aligned}$$

The statement then follows from Lemma 4.1. □

5. Bounds for the largest interval

Set $L_t = \max_{u\in(0,1)} \ell_t(u)$. We will begin by showing that $L_t \to 0$ at an exponential rate, using a comparison between the Ψ-process and the Kakutani process. We recall that assumption (D) is defined in Section 2.

Lemma 5.1. *Assume (D). Then, for every $\alpha \in (0, (\kappa_\Psi + 1)^{-1})$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists T : L_t \leq e^{-\alpha t}\,\forall t \geq T) = 1.$$

Proof. By the assumption on Ψ, the largest interval is split at rate at least $ce^t L_t^{\kappa_\Psi}$ at time t. L_t is therefore dominated by the length L'_t of the largest interval in the interval splitting process where *only* the largest interval is split, and this at rate $ce^t(L'_t)^{\kappa_\Psi}$. This process is a time changed version of the Kakutani process

mentioned in the introduction. If N_t denotes the number of times the largest interval has been split in this process, then it is known [Loo77, vZ78] that provided $N_t \to \infty$ as $t \to \infty$,

$$L'_t N_t \to 2 \text{ almost surely, as } t \to \infty. \tag{16}$$

Now fix $\alpha \in (0, (\kappa_\Psi + 1)^{-1})$ and let $\delta > 0$ such that $\alpha\kappa_\Psi < 1 - \alpha - \delta$. Let $t > 0$. Since L'_s is decreasing in s, we have for $t \geq 1$,

$$\int_0^t ce^s (L'_s)^{\kappa_\Psi}\, ds > c(L'_t)^{\kappa_\Psi}(e^t - 1) > \frac{c}{2}(L'_t)^{\kappa_\Psi} e^t.$$

Standard properties of Poisson processes then imply the existence of a Poisson distributed random variable P with parameter $(c/2)e^{(\alpha+\delta)t}$, such that on the event $\{L'_t > e^{-\alpha t}\}$, we have $N_t \geq P$. In particular, Chebychev's inequality yields that for large t,

$$\mathbb{P}(L'_t > e^{-\alpha t},\, N_t < e^{(\alpha+\delta/2)t}) \leq \mathbb{P}(P < e^{(\alpha+\delta/2)t}) < e^{-\alpha t}.$$

It now follows from (16) and the Borel–Cantelli lemma applied to the previous equation that $L'_t \leq e^{-\alpha t}$ for all large integer t. The lemma now follows (with any $\alpha' \in (0, \alpha)$ instead of α) from the fact that L'_t is decreasing in t. Since $\alpha \in (0, (\kappa_\Psi + 1)^{-1})$ was arbitrary, this proves the lemma. □

The following lemma, which is not needed for the proof of Theorem 1.1, gives the optimal exponent of the rate, under a more restrictive condition on Ψ. We believe that the result is true without this extra condition, but were not able to prove it.

Lemma 5.2. *Assume that Ψ has an absolutely continuous component whose derivative ψ satisfies $\psi(u) \geq c\kappa_\psi(1-u)^{\kappa_\psi - 1}$ in a neighborhood of 1, for some $\kappa_\psi \geq 1$. Then, for every $\alpha < \kappa_\Psi^{-1}$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists T : L_t \leq e^{-\alpha t}\, \forall t \geq T) = 1.$$

Proof. Fix $\alpha < \kappa_\psi^{-1}$. Fix $t > 0$. Let N_t be the number of intervals of length greater than $e^{-\alpha t}$ at time t. We claim that there exists $\beta > 0$, such that $\mathbb{P}(N_t > 0) < e^{-\beta t}$ for large t. In order to show this, consider the evolution of the collection of intervals of length at least $e^{-\alpha t}$ between the times 0 and t. By the definition of κ_ψ, if t is sufficiently large, the rate at which an interval of length ℓ splits into two in this process is at least

$$ce^s \ell^{\kappa_\psi} \geq ce^s e^{-(\kappa_\psi - 1)\alpha t}\ell.$$

This implies that $\mathbb{P}(N_t > 0) \leq \mathbb{P}(N'_t > 0)$, where N'_t is the number of intervals of length greater than $e^{-\alpha t}$ at time $e^t - 1$ in the process where an interval of length ℓ is split at rate $ce^{-(\kappa_\psi - 1)\alpha t}\ell$, i.e. a time changed uniform process.

This corresponds to asking for the probability that the largest spacing is greater than $e^{-\alpha t}$ in a Poisson process on $[0, 1]$ with intensity $c(e^t - 1)e^{-(\kappa_\psi - 1)\alpha t} \geq e^{(\alpha+\delta)t}$ for some positive δ and all t sufficiently large. Subdivide the interval into equally spaced intervals of length at most $e^{-\alpha t}/2$ and at least length $e^{-\alpha t}/3$. Having a spacing larger than $e^{-\alpha t}$ implies one of these intervals has no points. Applying a union bound, we get

$$\mathbb{P}(N'_t > 0) \leq 3e^{\alpha t} \exp(-e^{\delta t}/2)$$

This shows that for some $\beta > 0$, for large t,

$$\mathbb{P}(L_t > e^{-\alpha t}) = \mathbb{P}(N_t > 0) < e^{-\beta t}.$$

The Borel-Cantelli lemma then implies that $L_n \le e^{-\alpha n}$ for large n with probability one. Since L_t is decreasing, this implies that almost surely, $L_t \le e^{\alpha(1-t)}$ for large t, which yields the lemma. □

6. Entropy bounds

For a distribution function F, define

$$H(F) = \int_0^\infty (\log x) dF(x),$$

if the integral exists. When $F = A_t$, this is exactly the entropy of the empirical size-biased interval measure. Let $\tilde{H}_t = H(\widetilde{A}_t)$ and $H_t = H(A_t)$.

Lemma 6.1. *We have the following identities for the evolution of the entropy. For all $t \ge 0$,*

$$\tilde{H}_t = \tilde{H}_0 + \sum_{(s,u,v)\in\Pi,\, s\le t} \ell_s(u) W(v), \tag{17}$$

$$H_t = \tilde{H}_t + t = H_0 + \sum_{(s,u,v)\in\Pi,\, s\le t} \ell_s(u) W(v) + t, \tag{18}$$

where $W(v) = v\log v + (1-v)\log(1-v)$.

This observation is also used by Lootgieter [Loo77] and in Slud [Slu78], and it follows from a simple calculation, which we include for completeness.

Proof. Note that the identity for H_t follows immediately from the identity for $\tilde{H}_t$ on making the change of variables $y = e^{-t}x$, and so we turn to the first identity. From (3), we have

$$\tilde{H}_t = \tilde{H}_0 + \sum_{(s,u,v)\in\Pi,\, s\le t} \int_0^\infty (\log x)\, B(s,u,v,dx),$$

where $B(s,u,v,dx)$ is the Lebesgue–Stieltjes measure associated to the function $x \mapsto B(s,u,v,x)$. It thus suffices to establish that for all $(s,u,v) \in [0,\infty)\times[0,1]^2$,

$$\int_0^\infty (\log x)\, B(s,u,v,dx) = \ell_s(u) W(v).$$

We now have that

$$B(s,u,v,dx) = \ell_s(u)v(\delta_{\ell_s(u)v}(x) - \delta_{\ell_s(u)}(x)) + \ell_s(u)(1-v)(\delta_{\ell_s(u)(1-v)}(x) - \delta_{\ell_s(u)}(x)),$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^\infty (\log x) B(s,u,v,dx) &\\ &= \ell_s(u)v(\log \ell_s(u)v - \log \ell_s(u)) + \ell_s(u)(1-v)(\log \ell_s(u)(1-v) - \log \ell_s(u)) \\ &= \ell_s(u) W(v).\end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma. □

Using Lemma 6.1, we now calculate the drift and quadratic variation of H_t. By the change of variables formula (4), we have for every $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^1 \int_0^1 \ell_t(u) W(v)\, d\Psi(u) dv &= \int_0^1 \ell_t(u)\, d\Psi(u) \int_0^1 W(v)\, dv. \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \ell_t(u)\, d\Psi(u) \\ &= -\frac{e^{-t}}{2} \int_0^\infty z\, d\Psi(A_{t-}(z)).\end{aligned}$$

As for the quadratic term, we bound it by

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^1 \int_0^1 \left(\ell_t(u) W(v)\right)^2\, d\Psi(u) dv &= \int_0^1 \left(\ell_t(u)\right)^2 d\Psi(u) \int_0^1 W(v)^2\, dv. \\ &\leq L_t \int_0^1 \ell_t(u)\, d\Psi(u) \int_0^1 W(v)^2\, dv.\end{aligned}$$

We bound the integral of $W(v)^2$ by the following

$$\int_0^1 W(v)^2\, dv \leq 4 \int_0^1 v^2 (\log v)^2\, dv = \frac{8}{27}.$$

These calculations now imply the following result:

Lemma 6.2. *The process $H = (H_t)_{t \geq 0}$ solves the following stochastic differential equation:*

$$dH_t = (1 - D_t) dt + M_t, \quad D_t = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty z\, d\Psi(A_t(z)),$$

where $M = (M_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a martingale with previsible quadratic variation

$$d\langle M \rangle_t \leq L_t D_t\, dt.$$

Furthermore, we have for every $s < t$, $H_t - H_s \leq t - s$.

We now claim the following:

Proposition 6.3. *Assume (D). There exists a constant C, such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists T : H_t \leq C\, \forall t \geq T) = 1.$$

The next lemma tells us that D_t is large as soon is H_t is large.

Lemma 6.4. *Assume (D). Then there exists a constant C, such that for any probability distribution function F,*

$$H(F) > C \text{ implies } D(F) := \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty x\, d\Psi(F(x)) > 2.$$

Proof. We first note that by integration by parts, we have

$$D(F) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty [1 - \Psi(F(x))]\, dx, \tag{19}$$

as well as

$$H(F) = -\int_0^1 \frac{1}{x} F(x)\, dx + \int_1^\infty \frac{1}{x} (1 - F(x))\, dx \leq \int_1^\infty \frac{1}{x} (1 - F(x))\, dx. \tag{20}$$

Now fix $x_0 > 1$. Note that for some $c' > 0$, $1 - \Psi(u) \geq 2c'(1-u)^{\kappa_\Psi}$ by assumption. Now set $\alpha := (2\kappa_\Psi)^{-1}$. If $1 - F(x) > x^{-\alpha}$ for some $x > x_0$, then by (19) and the

fact that $1-\Psi(F(x))$ is decreasing in x, $D(F) > c'x^{1/2} > c'x_0^{1/2}$. On the other hand, if $1-F(x) \le x^{-\alpha}$ for all $x > x_0$, then $H(F) \le x_0 + \alpha^{-1}$ by (20). Hence, $H(F) > x_0 + \alpha^{-1}$ implies $D(F) > c'x_0^{1/2}$. Choosing x_0 large enough x_0 and setting $C = x_0 + \alpha^{-1}$ finishes the proof of the lemma. □

Proof of Proposition 6.3. Fix $\alpha \in (0, (\kappa_\Psi + 1)^{-1})$ and $t_0 > 0$ and define T to be the first time $t > t_0$, such that $L_t \ge e^{-\alpha t}$. Define the process $H^T = (H_t^T)_{t\ge 0}$ by

$$H_t^T = \begin{cases} H_t, & t < T \\ 0, & t \ge T \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 5.1, it is enough to show that there exists a constant C, such that $\mathbb{P}(\exists t > t_0 : H_t^T > C)$ can be made arbitrarily small for large t_0.

Let C be the constant from Lemma 6.4. We call an *excursion* of the process H^T a time interval $[t_1, t_2]$, such that $H_{t_1}^T \ge C+1$, and t_2 is the first time after t_1 that $H_{t_2}^T \le C$. We say that the excursion was *successful*, if $H_t^T \ge C+2$ for some $t \in [t_1, t_2]$ and *unsuccessful* otherwise. We further say that the process *goes on an excursion* at the time t, if t is the first time after the end of the last excursion that $H_t^T \ge C+1$.

Note that while the process H^T is on an excursion, it has a drift ≤ -1 by Lemmas 6.2 and 6.4. Furthermore, its jumps are bounded by 1 by definition (18). Standard calculations involving the optional stopping theorem now show that excursion is finite almost surely. In order to prove the proposition, it is therefore enough to show that the number of successful excursions is finite almost surely. For this, denote by $T_1 < T_2 < \dots$ the times where the process goes on an excursion. By the last statement of Lemma 6.2, we have $T_{n+1} - T_n > 1$ for every n, whence $T_n > n$ for every n. Furthermore, denote

$$P_n = \mathbb{P}(\text{the excursion stating at } T_n \text{ is successful} \,|\, \mathscr{F}_{T_n}).$$

By the Borel–Cantelli lemma, it is then enough to show that the sequence P_n is summable almost surely.

For this, we first note that H^T has no positive jumps, whence $H_{T_n}^T = C+1$ for every $n > 1$. Now, fix $n > 1$ and define the process

$$G_t = H_{T_n + A_t}^T, \text{ where } A_t \text{ is the inverse of } t \mapsto \int_0^t D_{s+T_n}\, ds.$$

Let τ be the first time that $G_\tau = C+2$ or $G_\tau \le C$ (in particular, $T_n + A_\tau \le T$, such that G_t is not frozen before the time τ). By Lemma 6.2, G_t then satisfies for $t < \tau$,

$$dG_t = (A_t - 1)dt + M_t',$$

with a martingale $(M_t')_{t\ge 0}$ with previsible quadratic variation $d\langle M'\rangle_t \le e^{-\alpha n}\, dt$. Note that by Lemma 6.4, $A_t < 1/2$ for all $t < \tau$. We therefore have

$$\mathbb{P}(G_\tau = C+2) \le \mathbb{P}(\sup_{t\le 4} M_t' > 1) \le 4e^{-\alpha n},$$

by Doob's L^2-martingale inequality. This shows that $P_n < 4e^{-\alpha n}$ for every n. This sequence is obviously summable and the above arguments now permit to conclude that the number of successful excursions is finite almost surely. This show that there exists a time T_0, such that $H_t^T \le C+2$ for all $t \ge T_0$ and finishes the proof of the proposition. □

7. Convergence of stochastic evolution

The goal of this section is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 7.1. *Assume (C) and (D). Then $\mathfrak{F}$ is nonempty. Furthermore, let F^Ψ be the distribution function of Lemma 3.5. Then almost surely, as $t \to \infty$, $A_t \to F^\Psi$ pointwise.*

As mentioned in the introduction, we will prove the theorem in a manner that mirrors analogous methodology developed by Kushner and Clark [KC78] to handle the case of ODE. This relies heavily on compactness arguments for function spaces.

Say that a family $\{\boldsymbol{F}^{(n)}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of functions in $\mathcal{X}$ is *asymptotically equicontinuous* if for any compact $K \subset [0,\infty)$ and $T > 0$,

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup_{\substack{s,t\geq 0\\ |s-t|\leq\delta}}\int_K \left|F_s^{(n)}(x) - F_t^{(n)}(x)\right| dx = 0.$$

To apply the argument we will establish the following properties of the stochastic evolution.

Proposition 7.2. *Assume (D). For the stochastic evolution $\boldsymbol{A}$, the following hold almost surely:*

1. *The collection of distribution functions $\{A_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ is tight.*
2. *The family $\{\boldsymbol{A}^{(n)}\}_{n\geq 0}$ defined by $A_t^{(n)} = A_{t+n}$ for every $t \geq 0$ is asymptotically equicontinuous.*
3. *The noise vanishes in the limit, i.e. $\boldsymbol{M}^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{X}} 0$ as $n \to \infty$, where $M_t^{(n)} = M_{t+n} - T_t M_n$ for every $t \geq 0$.*
4. *Almost surely, $\int_0^\infty x^{-2} A_t(x)\,dx \to 1$, as $t \to \infty$.*

Each of these claims are proven separately. For convenience, we list where each piece is proven. The tightness follows from the almost sure boundedness of entropy established by Proposition 6.3. Asymptotic equicontinuity is proven in Lemma 7.5. The vanishing of the noise is proven in Lemma 7.10. Finally, the convergence of the integrals follows from Lemma 7.7. We remark that assumption (D) is only used to establish the tightness claim.

Let us show how Proposition 7.2 implies the Theorem 7.1. We rely on the following consequence of Arzelà-Ascoli.

Lemma 7.3. *Suppose that $\{\boldsymbol{F}^{(n)}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is any family from $\mathcal{X}$ that is asymptotically equicontinuous, so that $\boldsymbol{F}^{(n)}$ is a step function when restricted to finite intervals, and so that the entire collection $\{F_t^{(n)}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R},n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is tight. Then the family $\{\boldsymbol{F}^{(n)}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is precompact and all its limit points $\boldsymbol{F}^{(\infty)}$ are in $C([0,\infty),\mathcal{D})$ and have that $F_t^{(\infty)}$ is a distribution function for each $t \geq 0$.*

Remark 7.4. Since $\mathcal{X}$ is a metric space, precompactness in $\mathcal{X}$ is equivalent to existence of convergent subsequences. Also note that this lemma is still correct without the additional assumption that $\boldsymbol{F}^{(n)}$ be a step function. We use this assumption simply to reduce the lemma to the standard Arzelà-Ascoli theorem.

Proof. As $\boldsymbol{F}^{(n)}$ is a step function, we may define a piecewise linear interpolation $\widehat{\boldsymbol{F}}^{(n)}$. For any pair (t_1, t_2) of consecutive jumps, we define

$$\widehat{F}_t^{(n)} = \frac{t - t_1}{t_2 - t_1}\left[F_{t_2}^{(n)} - F_{t_1}^{(n)}\right] + F_{t_1}^{(n)}$$

on the interval $[t_1, t_2]$. Note this definition makes $\widehat{F}_t^{(n)}$ equal to $F_t^{(n)}$ at jumps.

Further, from the convexity of integral of the norm, we have for every compact $K \subset [0,\infty)$ and every $T \geq 0, \delta > 0$,

$$\sup_{\substack{T\geq s,t\geq 0\\ |s-t|\leq\delta}} \int_K \left|\widehat{F}_s^{(n)}(x) - \widehat{F}_t^{(n)}(x)\right| dx \leq \sup_{\substack{s,t\geq 0\\ |s-t|\leq\delta}} \int_K \left|F_s^{(n)}(x) - F_t^{(n)}(x)\right| dx,$$

from which point equicontinuity of the family $\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{F}}^{(n)}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is easily checked. As $\mathcal{D}$ is compact, we have by Arzelà-Ascoli that this sequence has convergent subsequences in $C([0,T],\mathcal{D})$ for each $T > 0$. By diagonalization, we pick a convergent subsequence n_k on $C([0,\infty),\mathcal{D})$ converging locally uniformly to some $\boldsymbol{F}^{(\infty)}$. As for each $t \geq 0$, this is the limit of a tight sequence of distribution functions $F_t^{(n_k)}$, it follows that $F_t^{(\infty)}$ is a distribution function for every $t \geq 0$. □

Proof of Theorem 7.1. Throughout the proof, all statements regarding the stochastic evolution $\boldsymbol{A}$ are meant to hold almost surely. From Lemma 3.1, we have that

$$\boldsymbol{A}^{(n)} = \mathscr{S}^{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{A}^{(n)}) + \boldsymbol{M}^{(n)}. \tag{21}$$

By properties (1) and (2) of Proposition 7.2, and Lemma 7.3, we may choose a sequence $\boldsymbol{A}^{(n_k)}$ which converges in $\mathcal{X}$ to an $\boldsymbol{F}^{(\infty)} \in C([0,\infty),\mathcal{D})$ with $F_t^{(\infty)}(+\infty) = 1$ for every $t \geq 0$. Taking limits in (21), we get

$$\mathscr{S}^{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{A}^{(n_k)}) + \boldsymbol{M}^{(n_k)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{X}} \boldsymbol{F}^{(\infty)}.$$

By assumption (3) of Proposition 7.2, we have that $\boldsymbol{M}^{(n_k)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{X}} 0$, and by continuity of $\mathscr{S}^{\Psi}$, we get that

$$\mathscr{S}^{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{A}^{(n_k)}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{X}} \mathscr{S}^{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{F}^{(\infty)}).$$

Thus, we have that $\boldsymbol{F}^{(\infty)}$ is in $\mathfrak{F}$, and in particular $\mathfrak{F}$ is nonempty.

As $\mathfrak{F}$ is nonempty, Lemma 3.5 implies the existence of a unique distribution function F^{Ψ} so that any evolution $\boldsymbol{G} \in \mathfrak{F}$ has $\sup_{t\geq s} \left\|G_t - F^{\Psi}\right\|_{x^{-2}} \leq 2e^{-s}$. Furthermore, the stationary evolution $\boldsymbol{F}^* \equiv F^{\Psi}$ is contained in $\mathfrak{F}$.

We now turn to showing that $\boldsymbol{F}^{(\infty)} = \boldsymbol{F}^*$, which implies that $A_t \to F^{\Psi}$ as $t \to \infty$. For this, let $\varepsilon > 0$. By (8) in Lemma 2.1, there exists $\varepsilon' > 0$, such that $d_{L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}}(G,H) \leq \varepsilon/2$ as soon as $d_{x^{-2}}(G,H) < \varepsilon'$. Now suppose there exists a sequence $(t_k)_{k\geq 0}$ going to infinity, such that $d_{L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}}(A_{t_k}, F^{\Psi}) > \varepsilon$ for every k. Fix T, such that $2e^{-T} < \varepsilon'$. As above, the sequence $(t_k - T)_{k\geq 0}$ now contains a subsequence $(s_k)_{k\geq 0}$, such that $\boldsymbol{A}^{(s_k)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{X}} \boldsymbol{F}^{(\aleph)}$ as $k \to \infty$, for some $\boldsymbol{F}^{(\aleph)} \in \mathfrak{F}$. By Lemma 3.5,

$$\left\|F_T^{(\aleph)} - F^{\Psi}\right\|_{x^{-2}} \leq 2e^{-T} < \varepsilon',$$

such that for large k, by the triangle inequality,

$$d_{L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}}(A_T^{(s_k)}, F^{\Psi}) \leq d_{L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}}(A_T^{(s_k)}, F_T^{(\aleph)}) + d_{L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}}(F_T^{(\aleph)}, F^{\Psi}) < \varepsilon/2 + \varepsilon/2 = \varepsilon.$$

But since for every k, there exists k', such that $A_T^{(s_k)} = A_{t_{k'}}$, this is in contradiction to the fact that $d_{L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}}(A_{t_k}, F^{\Psi}) > \varepsilon$ for every k.

Thus we have shown local L^1 convergence of the distribution function A_t to F^{Ψ} as $t \to \infty$. From Lemma 3.5, F^{Ψ} is continuous, and hence the convergence holds pointwise. □

We now show how Theorem 7.1 implies Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let N_t denote the number of points of Π on $[0,t]$. As mentioned at the beginning of Section 2, we can realize $\widetilde{D}_n$ in terms of $\widetilde{A}_t$ in such a way that $\widetilde{A}_t = \widetilde{D}_{N_t}$ holds for all $t \geq 0$. Recall that $A_t(x) = \widetilde{A}_t(e^{-t}x)$ and $D_{N_t}(x) = \widetilde{D}_{N_t}(x/(N_t+n_0))$. The theorem now follows from Theorem 7.1 and the fact that $e^{-t}(N_t+n_0) \to 1$ almost surely as $t \to \infty$. □

Asymptotic equicontinuity. The next ingredient we need is the asymptotic equicontinuity of $\boldsymbol{A}^{(n)}$.

Lemma 7.5. *There is a $\delta_0 > 0$ and a constant C so that for every $0 < \delta < \delta_0$ there is T_δ random so that with probability* 1,

$$\sup_{t \geq T_\delta} \int_0^\infty \frac{|A_{t+\delta}(x) - A_t(x)|}{x^2}\, dx \leq C\delta.$$

This lemma depends very weakly on the details of the interval splitting procedure outlined in (3). The only randomness that needs to be considered are fluctuations in the times at which the points appear under the law of the Poisson process.

Lemma 7.6. *Set N_t to the number of points of Π with first coordinate in $[0,t]$. There is a $\delta_0 > 0$ and a constant C so that for every $0 < \delta < \delta_0$ there is T_δ random so that with probability* 1,

$$\sup_{t \geq T_\delta} [N_{t+\delta} - N_t] \leq 2\delta e^t.$$

Proof. Set $Q(t) = e^t - 1$, so that $N_{Q^{-1}(t)}$ is a standard Poisson process. By the law of large numbers, $N_{Q^{-1}(t)}/t \to 1$ almost surely as $t \to \infty$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{t\to\infty} \frac{N_{t+\delta} - N_t}{e^t} &= \limsup_{t\to\infty} \frac{N_{t+\delta} - N_t}{Q(t)} \\ &= \limsup_{t\to\infty} \frac{N_{t+\delta}}{Q(t+\delta)} \frac{Q(t+\delta)}{Q(t)} - \frac{N_t}{Q(t)} = e^\delta - 1\end{aligned}$$

almost surely. Hence, choosing δ_0 sufficiently small that $\delta < \delta_0$ implies $e^\delta - 1 \leq 2\delta$, the proof is complete. □

Lemma 7.7. *The following statements hold:*

(1) $\int_0^\infty x^{-2}\widetilde{A}_t(x)\, dx = N_t$.
(2) $\int_0^\infty x^{-2}A_t(x)\, dx \to 1$ *almost surely as* $t \to \infty$.

Proof. Recall from (3) that we can express $\widetilde{A}_t$ as

$$\widetilde{A}_t(x) = \widetilde{A}_0(x) + \sum_{(s,u,v)\in\Pi,\, s\leq t} B(s,u,v,x)$$

where

$$B(s,u,v,x) = \ell_s(u)\mathbf{1}\left\{\ell_s(u) > x\right\}\left(v\mathbf{1}\left\{\ell_s(u)v \leq x\right\} + (1-v)\mathbf{1}\left\{\ell_s(u)(1-v) \leq x\right\}\right).$$

On integrating $B(s,u,v,x)$, we have

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{B(s,u,v,x)}{x^2}\, dx = v\ell_s(u) \int_{\ell_s(u)v}^{\ell_s(u)} \frac{dx}{x^2} + (1-v)\ell_s(u) \int_{\ell_s(u)(1-v)}^{\ell_s(u)} \frac{dx}{x^2} = 1.$$

And thus, we have established (1). The second observation follows from changing variables

$$\int_0^\infty x^{-2} A_t(x)\,dx = e^{-t}\int_0^\infty x^{-2}\widetilde{A}_t(x)\,dx = e^{-t}N_t.$$

As $e^{-t}N_t \to 1$ almost surely, we have completed the proof. □

With this in hand, we now turn to proving Lemma 7.5.

Proof of Lemma 7.5. We begin by changing variables to remove the spatial scaling of the distribution functions

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{|A_{t+\delta}(x) - A_t(x)|}{x^2}\,dx = \int_0^\infty e^{-t}\frac{|\widetilde{A}_{t+\delta}(e^{-\delta}x) - \widetilde{A}_t(x)|}{x^2}\,dx. \tag{22}$$

The key observation is a pair of domination relations that vastly simplify the integral. On the one hand, from the fact that $\widetilde{A}_{t+\delta}$ is nondecreasing, we have that $\widetilde{A}_{t+\delta}(e^{-\delta}x) \le \widetilde{A}_{t+\delta}(x)$ for all $x \ge 0$. On the other hand, from the fact that $\widetilde{A}_{t+\delta}$ was built from $\widetilde{A}_t$ by adding non-negative functions, we have that $\widetilde{A}_{t+\delta}(x) \ge \widetilde{A}_t(x)$. Thus on applying both of these observations to (22) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-t}\int_0^\infty \frac{|\widetilde{A}_{t+\delta}(e^{-\delta}x) - \widetilde{A}_t(x)|}{x^2}\,dx \le\ & e^{-t}\int_0^\infty \frac{\widetilde{A}_{t+\delta}(x) - \widetilde{A}_{t+\delta}(e^{-\delta}x)}{x^2}\,dx \\ & + e^{-t}\int_0^\infty \frac{\widetilde{A}_{t+\delta}(x) - \widetilde{A}_t(x)}{x^2}\,dx. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

By applying Lemma 7.7 and a change of variables, the first of these integrals can be calculated exactly:

$$e^{-t}\int_0^\infty \frac{\widetilde{A}_{t+\delta}(x) - \widetilde{A}_{t+\delta}(e^{-\delta}x)}{x^2}\,dx = e^{-t}N_{t+\delta}(1 - e^{-\delta}). \tag{24}$$

We can also calculate the second integral exactly

$$e^{-t}\int_0^\infty \frac{\widetilde{A}_{t+\delta}(x) - \widetilde{A}_t(x)}{x^2}\,dx = e^{-t}\left(N_{t+\delta} - N_t\right). \tag{25}$$

By Lemma 7.7, there is a $\delta_0 > 0$ and a constant C so that for every $0 < \delta < \delta_0$ there is T_δ random so that with probability 1,

$$\sup_{t \ge T_\delta}\left[N_{t+\delta} - N_t\right] \le 2\delta e^t.$$

Similarily, we get that there is a $T < \infty$ random so that $N_t \le 2e^t$. Hence, combining (22), (23), (24) and (25) we get that

$$\sup_{t \ge T_\delta \wedge T}\int_0^\infty \frac{|A_{t+\delta}(x) - A_t(x)|}{x^2}\,dx \le 2(e^\delta - 1) + 2\delta,$$

so that picking $C > 0$ sufficiently large, we have completed the proof. □

Decay of the noise. The remaining condition to check is that $\boldsymbol{M}^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{X}} 0$. Consider the process $(I_t)_{t\geq 0}$ defined by

$$I_t = \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{x^3}(M_t(x))^2\,dx.$$

We will show that $I_t \to 0$, but before doing so, let us see how this implies that $\boldsymbol{M}^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{X}} 0$. Recall that $M_t^{(n)} = M_{t+n} - T_t M_n$.

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{x^3}\left(M_t^{(n)}\right)^2\,dx &= \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{x^3}\left(M_{t+n}(x) - M_n(e^{-t}x)\right)^2\,dx \\ &\leq 2\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{x^3}\left[\left(M_{t+n}(x)\right)^2 + \left(M_n(e^{-t}x)\right)^2\right]dx \\ &\leq 2I_{t+n} + e^{-2t}\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{x^3}(M_n(x))^2\,dx,\end{aligned}$$

where we have made a change of variables in the second integral. Thus we conclude

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{x^3}\left(M_t^{(n)}\right)^2\,dx \leq 2I_{t+n} + 2e^{-2t}I_n.$$

In particular if $I_t \to 0$, then

$$\sup_{t\geq 0}\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{x^3}\left(M_t^{(n)}(x)\right)^2\,dx \to 0$$

as $n \to \infty$. Then, for any fixed $k > 0$ and any $t \geq 0$, we may apply Cauchy-Schwarz to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^k \left|M_t^{(n)}(x)\right|\,dx &= \int_0^k x^{3/2}x^{-3/2}\left|M_t^{(n)}(x)\right|\,dx \\ &\leq \frac{k^2}{2}\Big[\int_0^k x^{-3}\left|M_t^{(n)}(x)\right|^2\,dx\Big]^{1/2}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus we actually conclude that for any fixed compact $K \subset [0,\infty)$

$$\sup_{t\geq 0}\int_K \left|M_t^{(n)}(x)\right|\,dx \to 0$$

as $n \to \infty$. All said, we have proven:

Lemma 7.8. *If $I_t \to 0$ almost surely, then $\boldsymbol{M}^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{X}} 0$ almost surely.*

We now turn to estimating I_t, which by a change of variables we can represent as

$$I_t = e^{-2t}\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{x^3}(\widetilde{M}_t(x))^2\,dx.$$

Hence, we set J_t to be

$$J_t = \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{x^3}(\widetilde{M}_t(x))^2\,dx,$$

and note that as $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{M}}(x)$ is a martingale for every x, this is a submartingale. Thus, by virtue of Doob's maximal inequality, to control its supremum in t, it is enough to control its expectation. Taking expectations, we have

$$\mathbb{E}J_t = \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{x^3}\mathbb{E}\left\langle \widetilde{\boldsymbol{M}}(x)\right\rangle_t dx, \tag{26}$$

with $\langle \boldsymbol{M}(x)\rangle_t$ the previsible quadratic variation.

As for the previsible quadratic variation, we have the following bound.

Lemma 7.9. *For any $x \geq 0$ and any $t \geq 0$,*

$$\left\langle \widetilde{\boldsymbol{M}}(x)\right\rangle_t \leq \frac{2x^3}{3}\int_0^t e^s \int_x^\infty \frac{1}{z} d\Psi(\widetilde{A}_s(z))\, ds.$$

Proof of Lemma 7.9. At a point $(s,u,v) \in \Pi$, the quadratic variation of $M_s(x)$ increases by at most $B(s,u,v,x)^2$. As the process is pure jump, we may write that

$$\left\langle \widetilde{\boldsymbol{M}}(x)\right\rangle_t \leq \int_0^t f(s,x)e^s\, ds$$

with $f(s,x)$ given by $B(s,u,v,x)^2$ conditional on $\mathscr{F}_{s-}$ and on the event that there is a jump at s, i.e.

$$f(s,x) = \iint B(s,u,v,x)^2\, d\Psi(u)dv.$$

Doing the v integral and applying the convexity of x^2, we may bound this by

$$\begin{aligned} f(s,x) &= \iint B(s,u,v,x)^2\, d\Psi(u)dv \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \ell_s(u)^2 \mathbf{1}\left\{\ell_s(u) > x\right\} \int_0^1 2v^2 \mathbf{1}\left\{\ell_s(u)v \leq x\right\} dv\, d\Psi(u) \\ &= \int_0^1 \ell_s(u)^2 \mathbf{1}\left\{\ell_s(u) > x\right\} \frac{2x^3}{3\ell_s(u)^3}\, d\Psi(u) \\ &= \frac{2x^3}{3}\int_x^\infty \frac{1}{z} d\Psi(A_{s-}(z)). \end{aligned}$$

□

With the quadratic variation estimate, the desired result about I_t follows immediately.

Lemma 7.10. *With probability* 1, *we have that*

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty} I_t = 0.$$

In particular, with probability 1, *we have $\boldsymbol{M}^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{X}} 0$ as $n \to \infty$.*

Proof. From (26) and Lemma 7.9, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}J_t \leq \mathbb{E}\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{x^3}\frac{2x^3}{3}\int_0^t e^s\, ds \int_x^\infty \frac{1}{z} d\Psi(\widetilde{A}_s(z))\, dx.$$

By applying the Fubini-Tonelli theorem, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^\infty \int_0^t e^s\, ds \int_x^\infty \frac{1}{z} d\Psi(\widetilde{A}_s(z))\, dx &= \int_0^t e^s \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{z} \int_0^z dx\, d\Psi(\widetilde{A}_s(z))\, ds \\ &= \int_0^t e^s \int_0^\infty \Psi(\widetilde{A}_s(z))\, ds \\ &= \int_0^t e^s\, ds.\end{aligned}$$

By Doob's maximal inequality, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{0\le s\le t} J_s > e^{3t/2}\right] \le e^{-t/2}.$$

Taking t to run over the natural numbers, we may apply Borel Cantelli to conclude there is a random $T<\infty$ so that $J_t \le Ce^{3t/2}$ for all $t>T$. Hence, as $I_t = e^{-2t}J_t$, we get that $I_t \to 0$ with probability 1. □

8. Properties of limiting profile

In this section, we study properties of the distribution function $F = F^\Psi$ from Lemma 3.5, i.e. the distribution function of the size-biased empirical measure of interval lengths in the limit as the number of intervals goes to infinity. We have the following lemma:

Lemma 8.1. *Assume Ψ is absolutely continuous with derivative ψ and $\mathfrak{F} \neq \emptyset$. Let $F = F^\Psi$ be the limiting distribution function from Lemma 3.5. Then $F \in C^1([0,\infty),[0,1])$, its derivative F' is absolutely continuous and F satisfies*

$$xF''(x) - F'(x) + xF'(x)\psi(F(x)) = 0 \tag{27}$$

for almost every x.

Proof. By Lemma 3.5, F is absolutely continuous and satisfies

$$F'(x) = x\int_x^\infty \frac{1}{z}\, d\Psi(F(z))$$

for almost every x. Under the assumption that Ψ is absolutely continuous, it follows that $x \mapsto \int_x^\infty \frac{1}{z}\, d\Psi(F(z))$ is continuous. From the fundamental theorem of calculus, it follows that F is in fact continuously differentiable and this equation holds for all x.

As such the integrand $\frac{1}{z}\, d\Psi(F(z)) = \frac{1}{z}\psi(F(z))F'(z)$ for almost every $z \in (0,\infty)$, and hence F' is absolutely continuous. Dividing through by x and differentiating both sides, we get that (27) holds for almost every x. □

In what follows, we study the right tail of the distribution function $F = F^\Psi$ from Lemma 3.5 (it is easily seen that the assumptions in the following statements imply (C) and (D), such that the assumptions of Lemma 3.5 are verified by the virtue of Theorem 7.1). We first study its right tail.

Proposition 8.2. *Assume that Ψ is absolutely continuous with derivative ψ satisfying $\lim_{u\to 1}\psi(u) = \psi(1) > 0$.*

1. *For every $a < \psi(1)$, we have $F'(x) \le e^{-ax}$ for large x.*

(2) *If furthermore there exists* $\beta > 1/\psi(1)$, *such that* $|\psi(1) - \psi(1-u)| \leq |\log u|^{-\beta}$ *for small enough* u, *then as* $x \to \infty$,

$$F'(x) \sim Cx \exp(-\psi(1)x),$$

for some $C > 0$.

Corollary 8.3. *In the max-k process (i.e.* $\Psi(u) = u^k$*), there exists* $C > 0$, *such that* $F'(x) \sim Cx \exp(-kx)$ *as* $x \to \infty$.

Proof of Proposition 8.2. Lemma 8.1 implies that

$$F''(x) = \left(\frac{1}{x} - \psi(F(x))\right) F'(x).$$

Rearranging, this implies that

$$\frac{d}{dx}\left(F'(x) \exp\left(-\int_1^x \frac{1}{y} - \psi(F(y))\, dy\right)\right) = 0.$$

Integrating this equation gives

$$\begin{aligned} F'(x) &= F'(1) \exp\left(\int_1^x \frac{1}{y} - \psi(F(y))\, dy\right) \\ &= F'(1)x \exp\left(-\int_1^x \psi(F(y))\, dy\right). \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Now assume that $\lim_{u\to 1} \psi(u) = \psi(1) > 0$. Since $F(x) \to 1$ as $x \to \infty$, the first statement follows directly from (28). Now assume that there exists $\beta > 1/\psi(1)$, such that $|\psi(1) - \psi(1-u)| \leq |\log u|^{-\beta}$ for small enough u. Let $a \in (\beta^{-1}, \psi(1)^{-1})$. Then by the first statement, we have $1 - F(x) \leq e^{-ax}$ for large x, which implies that

$$|\psi(1) - \psi(F(x))| \leq \frac{1}{x^{a\beta}}, \quad \text{for large } x.$$

In particular, the integral $\int_0^x (\psi(1) - \psi(F(y)))\, dy$ converges to a limit as $x \to \infty$. Together with (28), this now implies that

$$F'(x) = F'(1)x \exp\left(-\psi(1)x + \int_0^x (\psi(1) - \psi(F(y)))\, dy\right) \sim C'x \exp(-\psi(1)x),$$

as $x \to \infty$, for some $C' > 0$. This finishes the proof of the proposition. □

In contrast to the case treated in Proposition 8.2, the case $\lim_{u\to 1} \psi(u) = \psi(1) = 0$ is more delicate. Here we are only able to give a satisfying answer for the min-k process, i.e. $\psi(u) = k(1-u)^{k-1}$ for $k > 1$. In this case, we are able to transform equation (27) into an *autonomous* differential equation by setting $F(x) = 1 - G(\log x^{1/(k-1)})/x^{1/(k-1)}$. This equation can then be studied by standard phase plane analysis, yielding the following result:

Proposition 8.4. *Assume* $\Psi(u) = 1 - (1-u)^k$ *for some* $k > 1$. *Then, as* $x \to \infty$,

$$1 - F(x) \sim \frac{c_k}{x^{1/(k-1)}} \text{ and } F'(x) \sim \frac{c_k}{(k-1)x^{1+1/(k-1)}},$$

where $c_k = ((2k-1)/k(k-1))^{1/(k-1)}$.

Proof. As F is continuously differentiable, we have that (27) holds everywhere. Set $\overline{F}(x) = 1 - F(x)$, so that this differential equation becomes

$$x\overline{F}''(x) - \overline{F}'(x) + xk\overline{F}(x)^{k-1}\overline{F}'(x) = 0.$$

The substitution $\overline{F}(x) = G(\log x^{1/(k-1)})/x^{1/(k-1)}$ or $G(t) = e^t\overline{F}(e^{(k-1)t})$ then yields the autonomous differential equation

$$G'' - G' - (2k - 1 - k(k-1)G^{k-1})(G' - G) = 0. \tag{29}$$

We can now study (29) by usual phase plane analysis (see e.g. [Arn92]). For this, we consider the two-dimensional ODE

$$\begin{pmatrix} G \\ G' \end{pmatrix}' = \begin{pmatrix} G' \\ G'' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} G' \\ G' + (2k - 1 - k(k-1)G^{k-1})(G' - G) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{30}$$

We now study the possible orbits of solutions to (30) and identify the one that corresponds to our particular solution. We first note that since $\overline{F}(0) = 1$, we have $G(-\infty) = 0$. Furthermore, $G \geq 0$. We will now rule out several orbits through a chain of arguments.

(1) *$G(t)$ cannot go to ∞ as $t \to \infty$.* For, suppose that $\lim_{t\to\infty} G(t) = \infty$. Define $H(t) = G(t) - G'(t)$. Equation (29) then implies that for large t, $H'(t) < -H(t)$ if $H(t) > 0$. This shows that $G'(t) > G(t) - 1$ for large t. Gronwall's inequality then shows that $G(t) > Ce^t$ for some $C > 0$ and for large t. But this contradicts the fact that $G(t) = e^t\overline{F}(e^{(k-1)t}) = o(e^t)$, which follows from the fact that $\overline{F}(x) \to 0$ as $x \to \infty$. This contradiction shows that $G(t)$ cannot go to ∞ as $t \to \infty$.

(2) *$G'(t)$ has to reach 0 at some time $t_0 \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$.* The previous point together with the fact that $G \geq 0$ implies that $G(t)$ has an accumulation point. But this implies that $G'(t)$ has to reach 0 at some finite or infinite time.

(3) *We have $t_0 = \infty$ and $G(\infty) = c_k$.* In order to show this, we first note that $(a, 0)$ is a critical point of the ODE (30) if and only if

$$(2k - 1 - k(k-1)a^{k-1})a = 0,$$

i.e. if and only if $a \in \{0, c_k\}$. Now, since t_0 is the first time that $G'(t)$ reaches 0 and since $G(t) \geq 0 = G(-\infty)$ for every t, we must have had $G'(t) > 0$ for $t < t_0$, hence $G(t_0) > 0$. Since $(c_k, 0)$ is the only critical point from the set $(0, \infty) \times \{0\}$, we have $t_0 = \infty$ if and only if $G(t_0) = c_k$. It remains to show that we have indeed $G(t_0) = c_k$. We argue again by contradiction.

First suppose that $G(t_0) \in (0, c_k)$, which implies that $t_0 < \infty$. Then (29) implies that for any $t_1 > t_0$, if $G(t) \geq 0$ and $G'(t) \leq 0$ for all $t \in [t_0, t_1]$, then $G''(t) < -c$ for some constant $c > 0$. This implies that there exists $t > t_0$ with $G(t) < 0$, which is impossible.

Now suppose that $G(t_0) > c_k$, which again implies that $t_0 < \infty$. By (29), there exist $c, \varepsilon > 0$, such that $G'' > c$ as long as $(G, G') \in [G(t_0), \infty) \times [0, \varepsilon]$. In particular, $G'(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \geq t_0$. Moreover, there exists a time t_1, such that $G'(t_1) > \varepsilon$ and since G'' is continuous, $G'(t) > \varepsilon$ for all $t > t_1$. Hence, $G(t) \to \infty$ as $t \to \infty$, which we ruled out before.

The preceding arguments imply that $G(\infty) = c_k$ and $G'(\infty) = 0$ (and also that $G'(t) > 0$ for all t). This now gives as $x \to \infty$,

$$\overline{F}(x) \sim \frac{c_k}{x^{1/(k-1)}}, \quad \text{and}$$
$$\overline{F}'(x) = \frac{-G(\log x^{1/(k-1)}) + G'(\log x^{1/(k-1)})}{(k-1)x^{1+1/(k-1)}} \sim -\frac{c_k}{(k-1)x^{1+1/(k-1)}}.$$

This finishes the proof of the lemma. □

Remark 8.5. The critical point $(c_k, 0)$ of the ODE (30) is in fact a saddle point. This can be used to yield another proof of the uniqueness of the solution to (27) with $\psi(u) = k(1-u)^{k-1}$ and the boundary conditions $F(0) = 0$, $F(\infty) = 1$, $F \geq 0$.

Lastly, we study the asymptotics when the measure $d\Psi$ converges weakly to δ_1 (which corresponds to the *Kakutani process* as mentioned in the introduction). Formally, the function F satisfies in this case the equation

$$xF'' - F' + xF'(x-)\delta_1(F(x)) = 0,$$

which implies that F is of the form $F(x) = Cx^2 \wedge 1$ for some $C > 0$. Since $F'(x)/x$ is the density of the interval distribution, we have with $x_0 = 1/\sqrt{C}$,

$$1 = \int_0^\infty F'(x)/x \, dx = 2Cx_0 = 2\sqrt{C} \Rightarrow C = 1/4.$$

The following proposition makes this argument rigorous:

Proposition 8.6. *Let $(\Psi_n)_{n\geq 0}$ be a sequence of distribution functions of measures on $(0,1]$ with $\Psi_n(x) \to 0$ for all $x \in (0,1)$. Assume that for all these Ψ_n, there are distribution functions F_n satisfying*

$$F_n(x) = \int_0^x y \int_y^\infty \frac{1}{z} d\Psi_n(F_n(z)) \, dy \tag{31}$$

for all $x \geq 0$. Then $F_n(x) \to x^2/4 \wedge 1$ pointwise as $n \to \infty$.

Proof. It follows immediately from the integral equation satisfied by F_n that it is absolutely continuous and thus satisfies (11) for almost every x.

We begin by showing that the $\{F_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ are tight. Dividing (11) by x and integrating, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_x^\infty \frac{dF_n(y)}{y} &= \int_x^\infty \int_y^\infty \frac{d\Psi_n(F_n(z))}{z} \, dy \\ &= \int_x^\infty \frac{z-x}{z} d\Psi_n(F_n(z)) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{2x}^\infty d\Psi_n(F_n(z)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(1 - \Psi_n(F_n(2x))). \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

On the other hand, we get that

$$\int_x^\infty \frac{dF_n(y)}{y} \leq \frac{1}{x} \int_x^\infty dF_n(y) \leq \frac{1}{x}. \tag{33}$$

From the convergence of $\Psi_n \to 0$, we have that for any $\delta > 0$ and any $\epsilon > 0$, there is an n_0 sufficiently large so that for $n \geq n_0$, $\Psi_n(u) \leq \epsilon$ for $u \leq 1 - \delta$. Thus, combining (32) and (33) we get that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \frac{2}{x} &\leq \Psi_n(F_n(2x)) \\ &\leq \epsilon \mathbf{1}\left\{F_n(2x) \leq 1 - \delta\right\} + \mathbf{1}\left\{F_n(2x) > 1 - \delta\right\} \\ &\leq \epsilon + \mathbf{1}\left\{F_n(2x) > 1 - \delta\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Setting $x = 4$ in the above equation and assuming $\epsilon < 1/2$, we have $F_n(8) > 1 - \delta$ for all $n \geq n_0$. This implies tightness of the sequence $(F_n)_{n \geq 0}$.

Integrating (31) by parts, we have that

$$F_n(x) = -\int_0^x \Psi_n(F_n(z))\, dz + \int_0^x z \int_z^\infty \frac{1}{y^2} \Psi(F_n(y))\, dydz.$$

By passing to a convergent subsequence, we may assume that there is a nondegenerate distribution function F_* so that $F_n \to F_*$ at every point of continuity of F_*. We then get that $\Psi_n(F_n)$ converges almost everywhere to $\mathbf{1}\left\{F_*(x) \geq 1\right\}$. By dominated convergence, we can pass to the limit in the previous equation to get

$$F_*(x) = -\int_0^x \mathbf{1}\left\{F_*(z) \geq 1\right\}\, dz + \int_0^x z \int_z^\infty \frac{1}{y^2} \mathbf{1}\left\{F_*(y) \geq 1\right\}\, dydz.$$

Let $x_0 = \sup\{x : F_*(x) < 1\}$. Note that if $x_0 = \infty$, then both integrals are identically 0, implying $F_* \equiv 0$ and contradicting the tightness of F_n. For any $x \leq x_0$, we get that

$$F_*(x) = \int_0^x z \int_z^\infty \frac{1}{y^2} \mathbf{1}\left\{F_*(y) \geq 1\right\}\, dydz = \int_0^x \frac{z}{x_0} dz = \frac{x^2}{2x_0}.$$

This forces $x_0 = 2$, and hence $F_* \equiv x^2/4 \wedge 1$. As this holds for every subsequential limit of F_n, we have completed the proof. □

References

[ABKU99] Yossi Azar, Andrei Z Broder, Anna R Karlin, and Eli Upfal. Balanced allocations. *SIAM journal on computing*, 29(1):180–200, 1999.

[ADS09] Dimitris Achlioptas, Raissa M. D'Souza, and Joel Spencer. Explosive percolation in random networks. *Science*, 323(5920):1453–1455, 2009.

[Arn92] Vladimir I. Arnol'd. *Ordinary differential equations*. Springer Textbook. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, translated edition, 1992.

[BD87] Michael D. Brennan and Richard Durrett. Splitting intervals II: Limit laws for lengths. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 75(1):109–127, May 1987.

[Ber06] Jean Bertoin. *Random fragmentation and coagulation processes*, volume 102 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.

[CCZ13] Hervé Cardot, Peggy Cénac, and Pierre-André Zitt. Efficient and fast estimation of the geometric median in Hilbert spaces with an averaged stochastic gradient algorithm. *Bernoulli*, 19(1):18–43, February 2013.

[Dar53] D. A. Darling. On a Class of Problems Related to the Random Division of an Interval. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 24(2):239–253, June 1953.

[Deh82] Paul Deheuvels. Strong Limiting Bounds for Maximal Uniform Spacings. *The Annals of Probability*, 10(4):1058–1065, November 1982.

[Dev81] Luc Devroye. Laws of the Iterated Logarithm for Order Statistics of Uniform Spacings. *The Annals of Probability*, 9(5):860–867, October 1981.

[Dev82] Luc Devroye. A Log Log Law for Maximal Uniform Spacings. *The Annals of Probability*, 10(3):863–868, August 1982.

[DKM07] R. M. D'Souza, P. L. Krapivsky, and C. Moore. The power of choice in growing trees. *The European Physical Journal B*, 59(4):535–543, 2007.

[DMWZZ04] Persi Diaconis, Eddy Mayer-Wolf, Ofer Zeitouni, and Martin P. W. Zerner. The Poisson-Dirichlet law is the unique invariant distribution for uniform split-merge transformations. *The Annals of Probability*, 32(1B):915–938, January 2004.

[KC78] Harold J. Kushner and Dean S. Clark. *Stochastic approximation methods for constrained and unconstrained systems*, volume 26 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1978.

[Loo77] J. C. Lootgieter. Sur la répartition des suites de Kakutani. I. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré (B) Probabilités et Statistiques*, 13(4):385–410, 1977.

[MP13] Y. Malyshkin and E. Paquette. The power of 2 choices over preferential attachment. *ArXiv e-print 1311.1091*, November 2013.

[Pyk80] Ronald Pyke. The Asymptotic Behavior of Spacings Under Kakutani's Model for Interval Subdivision. *The Annals of Probability*, 8(1):157–163, February 1980.

[RW12] Oliver Riordan and Lutz Warnke. Achlioptas process phase transitions are continuous. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 22(4):1450–1464, 2012.

[Sch05] Oded Schramm. Compositions of random transpositions. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 147(1):221–243, December 2005.

[Slu78] Eric Slud. Entropy and maximal spacings for random partitions. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete*, 41(4):341–352, December 1978.

[Slu82] Eric V. Slud. Correction to "entropy and maximal spacings for random partitions". *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete*, 60(1):139–141, May 1982.

[vZ78] W. R. van Zwet. A Proof of Kakutani's Conjecture on Random Subdivision of Longest Intervals. *The Annals of Probability*, 6(1):133–137, February 1978.

[Wal77] H. Walk. An invariance principle for the Robbins-Monro process in a Hilbert space. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete*, 39(2):135–150, June 1977.

[Wei55] Lionel Weiss. The Stochastic Convergence of a Function of Sample Successive Differences. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 26(3):532–536, September 1955.

[Whi97] W. A. Whitworth. *Choice and Chance*. Cambridge University Press, 1897.

[Yin92] G. Yin. On h-valued stochastic approximation: finite dimensional projections. *Stochastic Analysis and Applications*, 10(3):363–377, 1992.

Department of Mathematics, Weizmann Institute of Science
E-mail address: pascal.maillard@weizmann.ac.il

Department of Mathematics, Weizmann Institute of Science
E-mail address: elliot.paquette@gmail.com